arXiv:1604.01560v2 [cs.CC] 7 Apr 2016

Non-deterministic branching programs with logarithmic repetition cannot efficiently compute small monotone CNFs

Oded Lachish and Igor Razgon
Department of Computer Science and Information Systems, Birkbeck, University of London
{oded,igor}@dcs.bbk.ac.uk

Abstract

In this paper we establish an exponential lower bound on the size of syntactic non-deterministic read d-times branching programs for $d \leq \log n/10^5$ computing a class of monotone CNFs with a linear number of clauses. This result provides the first separation of classes NP and co-NP for syntactic branching programs with a logarithmic repetition and the first separation of syntactic non-deterministic branching programs with a logarithmic repetition from small monotone CNFs.

1 Introduction

We study here the complexity of syntactic non-deterministic branching programs (NBPs) with bounded repetition d (read-d-times NBPs or simply d-NBPs). We prove an exponential lower bound for $\log n/10^5$-NBPs computing a class of functions that are expressible as monotone CNFs with a linear number of clauses. As the complement of a small CNF is a small DNF having a linear size presentation as 1-NBP, our result separates NP and co-NP for branching programs with $\log n/10^5$ repetition.

The previous record for separating classes NP and co-NP for syntactic NBPs was for d-NBPs with d up to $\Theta(\log n/\log\log n)$. It was achieved in 1994, by Jukna [5].

To the best of our knowledge, the paper of Jukna and Schnitger [8] (Theorem 3.3.) is the only result that separates small monotone CNFs from d-NBPs. It does so with $d = o(\log n/\log\log n)$. We note that they do not state this explicitly, but we can easily get to this conclusion because of the following. Their lower bound is established for a function on graphs that is true if and only if the given graph does not contain a 4-clique. This function can be presented as a CNF with 6 literals per clause, all of them negative. A simple reduction shows that if all these negative literals are replaced by positive ones then the lower bound retains for the obtained monotone CNF. We are also not aware of other results separating d-NBPs, with $d > 1$, from monotone functions or from non-monotone CNFs.

Prior to these two results, in 1993, Borodin, Razborov and Smolensky proved an exponential lower bound for d-NBPs for d up to $\Theta(\log n)$ computing a class of functions

that is not known to be monotone or to have small d-NBP for its complement. The results mentioned created two natural open questions: (i) is there $d = \Theta(\log n)$ such that classes NP and co-NP are different for syntactic branching programs with repetition up to d?; and (ii) is it possible to separate d-NBP for *some* $d = \Theta(\log n)$ from monotone functions or from CNFs or from monotone CNFs? Our result resolves these problems by providing a positive answers to both.

As mentioned above, besides [8], we are not aware of other super-polynomial lower bounds for d-NBPs with $d > 1$ on CNFs nor on monotone functions. However, such lower bounds exist for read-once branching programs. For example, an exponential lower bound for deterministic read-once branching programs on small monotone CNFs was presented in [4]. In [10], the second author showed a parametrized $n^{\Omega(k)}$ for 1-NBPs lower bound computing monotone 2-CNFs whose underlying graph has tree-width at most k. This lower bound can easily be converted into an exponential one by taking the underlying graph to be an expander.

Currently, there are no super-polynomial lower bounds for syntactic branching programs with super-logarithmic repetition, even deterministic ones. However, there is an exponential lower bound for *oblivious branching programs* with $o(\log^2 n)$ repetition [2] (presented in a more general form of $o(n \log^2 n)$ trade-off). We note that oblivious branching programs are a special case of NBPs with the same order of variable occurrences along every source-sink path.

Researchers have also investigated branching programs for functions with non-Boolean domains of variables. One purpose of considering this framework for NBPs is to obtain lower bounds for *semantic* rather than syntactic NBPs that bound the number of variable occurrences on consistent paths only. Such lower bounds are known for functions with non-Boolean domains [6], however, in the Boolean case, super-polynomial lower bounds have not yet been established even for semantic 1-NBPs.

For a more detailed survey of research on branching programs, we refer the reader to the monographs of Jukna [7] and Wegener [11].

Overview of result: We construct a dedicated family of small monotone formulae. We then prove that for every member φ of this family every $\log n/10^5$-NBP Z, where n is the number of variables in φ, computing φ has size exponential in n.

From a birds eye view the proof proceeds as follows. Given an $\log n/10^5$-NBP Z computing a member φ of the family, we show that the properties of φ imply that every computational path P of Z contains a special set of $O(\log n)$ vertices, we call a *determining set*. Then we show that Z has an exponential number of distinct determining sets. This concludes our result since there can be this many distinct determining sets only if the size of Z is exponential in n. We next describe how this is achieved.

We first reduce the problem of proving exponential lower bounds for d-NBPs to the special case of proving exponential lower bounds for *uniform* d-NBP, which are NBPs such that along every one of their source-sink paths, every variable occurs exactly k times. Then we look at an arbitrary computational path P in Z as a string where the variables on the path are the letters. We use a structural theorem of Alon and Maass (Theorem 1.1. [1]), to deduce that there exists a set of $O(\log n)$ indices that split the string into a set of consecutive substrings (*intervals*) each between two consecutive

indices of this set. This set of intervals has a special property that there exists two large sets of specific letters (variables), where by large we mean n^α for some $\alpha > 0$, such that the first, which we call the *odd set*, has letters that only appear in odd intervals, where the "odd" is according to their order, and the second, which we call the *even set*, has letters that only appear in even intervals. The set of vertices on the path P corresponding to the set of indices is the determining set X. We next explain how we use the special property of the intervals.

In order to utilize the properties of the odd and even sets we defined the dedicated family of CNFs based on a special type of graphs we call *pseudoexpander*s. This construction ensures that there is a large matching M_X between members of the odd set and the even set, with each pair in the matching corresponding to a distinct clause in φ. Based on this matching we define a formula ψ_X, which is satisfied by the assignment of the computational path P. We construct a probability space on the set of satisfying assignment of φ, such that the probability that a formula ψ_X is satisfied is exponentially small in the size of M_X and, since M_X is large, is, in fact, exponentially small in the number of variables of φ. Clearly the conjunction, over all the computational paths of Z, of formulae ψ_X corresponding to the paths, is satisfied with probability 1. Thus, there must be exponentially many formulae ψ_X and in turn exponentially many distinct determining sets.

We remark, regarding the construction of CNFs, that we first prove the existence of the considered class of CNFs φ non-constructively, using a probabilistic method. In the Appendix, we show that there is a deterministic polynomial time procedure constructing a class of small monotone CNFs φ^* such that φ can be obtained from φ^* by a partial assignment to the latter. It can be observed that the exponential lower bound on $\log n/10^5$-NBPs retains for φ^*. That is, our result holds for a set of constructively created CNFs.

Structure of the paper. The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 contains all the preliminary definitions and notations. Section 3 proves the main result with the proofs of the auxiliary results postponed to the later sections. In particular, Section 4 establishes existence of pseudoexpanders, Section 5 proves that each computational path of the considered branching programs contains a determining set and Section 6 proves the exponentially low probability claim described above. The paper also has an appendix consisting of four sections. In the Section A we provide a poly-size simulation of d-NBPs by uniform d-NBPs. In Section B, we show that the exponential lower bound for $O\log n/10^5$-NBPs applies to 'constructively created' CNFs (proving the theorem at the end of Section 3). In Section C we prove auxiliary lemmas for Section 5. In Section D we prove the validity of the definition of probability space used in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

Sets of literals as assignments. In this paper by a *set of literals* we mean one that does not contain both an occurrence of a variable and its negation. For a set S of literals we denote by $Vars(S)$ the set of variables whose literals occur in S (the $Vars$

notation naturally generalizes to CNFs, Boolean functions, and branching programs). A set S of literals represents the truth assignment to $Vars(S)$ where variables occurring positively in S (i.e. whose literals in S are positive) are assigned with $true$ and the variables occurring negatively are assigned with $false$. For example, the assignment $\{x_1 \leftarrow true, x_2 \leftarrow true, x_3 \leftarrow false\}$ to variables x_1, x_2, x_3 is represented as $\{x_1, x_2, \neg x_3\}$.

Satisfying assignments. Let φ be a CNF. A set S of literals *satisfies* a clause C of φ if at least one literal of C belongs to S. If all clauses of φ are satisfied by S then S *satisfies* φ. If, in addition, $Vars(\varphi) = Vars(S)$ then we say that S is a *satisfying assignment* of φ. The notion of a satisfying assignment naturally extends to Boolean functions F meaning a truth assignment to $Vars(F)$ on which F is true.

Definition 1 (Non-deterministic branching programs and related notions).

- *A* Non-deterministic branching program *(*NBP*)* Z *is a directed acyclic multigraph (*DAG*) with one source and one sink with some edges labelled with literals of variables.* $Vars(Z)$ *denotes the set of variables whose literals occur on the edges of* Z*.*
- *A directed source-sink path* P *of* Z *is a* computational path *of* Z *if opposite literals of the same variable do not occur as labels of edges of* P*. We denote by* $A(P)$ *the set of literals labelling the edges of* P*. We call* $A(P)$ *the assignment* carried *by* P*.*
- *The function* F_Z computed *by* Z *is a function on* $Vars(Z)$*. A set of literals over* $Vars(Z)$ *is a satisfying assignment if and only if there is a computational path* P *of* Z *such that* $A(P) \subseteq S$*.*
- *The size of* Z*, denoted by* $|Z|$ *is the number of its vertices.*

Definition 2 (Read d times NBP). *A syntactic* read-d-times NBP *(d-NBP) is an* NBP *in which each variable occurs at most* d *times on each source-think path. A* d-NBP *is* uniform *if each variable occurs* exactly d *times on each source-sink path.*

Lemma 1. *For every* d-NBP Z*, there exist a uniform* d-NBP *computing* F_Z *and having size* $O(|Z|^4 d)$

The proof of Lemma 1 appears in the Appendix.

It follows from Lemma 1 that an exponential lower bound obtained for a uniform d-NBP applies to a d-NBP in general. Therefore, in the rest of the paper (except, obviously, for the proof of Lemma 1), we assume (without stating it explicitly) that all the considered d-NBPs are uniform. For the purpose of establishing the lower bound, the advantage of considering uniform NBPs is that for any two paths of an NBP having the same initial and final vertices, the sets of variables labelling these paths are the same, as proved in the next lemma.

Lemma 2. *Let* Z *be a* d-NBP*. Let* P_1 *and* P_2 *be two paths of* Z *having the same initial and final vertices. Then a variable occurs on* P_1 *if and only if it occurs on* P_2*.*

Proof. Let u and v be the starting and ending vertices of P_1 and P_2. Denote by $start$ and end the source and sink vertices of Z, respectively. Let P_0 be a $start \longrightarrow u$ path of Z and P_3 be a $v \longrightarrow end$ path of Z. Due to the acyclicity of Z, both $Q_1 = P_0 + P_1 + P_3$ (the concatenation of P_0, P_1, P_3) and $Q_2 = P_0 + P_2 + P_3$ are source-sink paths of Z. Suppose there is a variable x occurring on P_1 but not on P_2. Then, to supply d occurrences of x on Q_2 required because Z is uniform, x occurs d times in $P_1 \cup P_3$. It follows that on Q_1, x occurs at least $d+1$ times in contradiction to the definition of a d-NBP. ■

Now, we introduce terminology related to graphs and trees and we will need for definition of the CNF class.

Definition 3. *A rooted tree is called* extended *if none of its leaves has a sibling.*

Definition 4 (Binary tree based graphs (BTB)). *A graph H is a binary tree based graph if:*

1. *H is an edge-disjoint union of extended trees $\mathbf{T}(H) = \{T_1, \ldots, T_m\}$ with roots $t_1, \ldots, t_m$ which we call the* root vertices *of H and denote by $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$. The set of all leaves of $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ is denoted by $\mathbf{Leaves}(H)$.*
2. *Each vertex of $u \in \mathbf{Leaves}(H)$ is a leaf of exactly two trees of $\mathbf{T}(H)$.*
3. *Any two trees of $\mathbf{T}(H)$ have at most one vertex in common. This common vertex is a leaf in both trees.*

In what follows we denote $|V(H)|$ by n and $|\mathbf{Roots}(H)|$ by m.

Definition 5 (Adjacency of trees in BTB). *Let $H \in \mathbf{BTB}$ with $\mathbf{T}(H) = \{T_1, \ldots, T_m\}$ and $\mathbf{Roots}(H) = \{t_1, \ldots, t_m\}$ where each t_i is the root of T_i.*

- *T_i and T_j are adjacent if and only if they share a leaf in common. The common leaf of T_i and T_j is denoted by $\ell_{i,j}$.*
- *The unique path connecting roots of T_i and T_j in $T_i \cup T_j$ is denoted by $P_{i,j}$.*
- *The path connecting t_i and $\ell_{i,j}$ is in T_i is denoted by $P^{1/2}_{i \to j}$ and the path connecting t_j and $\ell_{i,j}$ is in T_j is denoted by $P^{1/2}_{j \to i}$. (The $1/2$ in the subscript says that these paths are 'halves' of $P_{i,j}$.)*

Definition 6 (Pseudoedges and pseudomatchings). *Let $H \in \mathbf{BTB}$ and U, V be two disjoint subsets of $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$.*

- *A* pseudoedge *of H is a pair $\{t_i, t_j\}$ of roots such that T_i and T_j are adjacent. The* pseudodegree *of t_i is the number of pseudoedges containing t_i*
- *A* pseudomatching *of H is a set of pseudoedges of H that do not share common ends.*
- *A pseudomatching M is* between *U and V if for each $e \in M$, $|e \cap U| = |e \cap V| = 1$.*

For a pseudomatching M, we denote $\bigcup_{e\in M} e$ by $\bigcup M$.

Definition 7 (Underlying graph for a graph in BTB). *The underlying graph $U(H)$ is a graph whose vertices are $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$ and two vertices in $U(H)$ are adjacent if and only if their corresponding trees are adjacent in H.*

3 The main result

Strategy of the proof. Fix Z to be a d-NBP that computes a φ. The goal is to show that Z is exponentially large in the number n of variables of φ. To do so we prove that every computational path P of Z has a set of variables X, of size logarithmic in n that has specific properties which enable us to prove the following: Z contains an exponential in n number of such distinct sets. Since the size of these sets is logarithmic in n, the lower bound on the size of Z easily follows. The specific properties of X are listed next.

1. There is a special formula ψ_X defined on the variables of φ such that for any path Q containing X, the assignment $A(Q)$ carried by Q satisfies ψ_X.
2. There is a probability space on the set of satisfying assignments of φ, so that the probability that an assignment drawn from the space satisfies ψ_X is exponentially small in n.

Now, since every computational path contains a set X, every satisfying assignment S of φ satisfies some ψ_X. This, together with the last statement above, implies that the number of formulae ψ_X must be exponentially large in n, and hence also the number of sets X.

The CNF for which we prove the lower bound is based on a special class of graphs we call pseudoexpanders and defined next and afterwards we define the actual CNFS. Recall that m denotes the number of roots of $H \in \mathbf{BTB}$.

Definition 8 (Pseudoexpanders). *$H \in \mathbf{BTB}$ is a* pseudoexpander *if the following two conditions hold.*

1. Small height property. *The height (the largest number of vertices of a root-leaf path) of each T_i is at most $(\log m)/4.9 + 3$.*
2. Large pseudomatching property. *For any two disjoint subsets U, V of $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$ of size at least $m^{0.999}$ each, there is a pseudomatching of H between U and V of size at least $m^{0.999}/3$.*

The the class of all pseudoexpanders is denoted by $\mathbf{PE}$.

Definition 9. *For H, $\mathbf{T}(H)$ and $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$ as in Definition 5, a CNF ϕ_H is defined as follows.*

The variables of ϕ_H are the vertices of H. The clauses $C_{i,j}$ of ϕ_H are in bijective correspondence with the pseudoedges of H and the literals of $C_{i,j}$ are $V(P_{i,j})$.

The class $\{\phi_H | H \in \mathbf{PE}\}$ is denoted by $\mathbf{\Phi}(\mathbf{PE})$.

We are going to prove that $O(\log n)$-NBPs require an exponential size to compute the class $\mathbf{\Phi}(\mathbf{PE})$. Note that Definition 8 does not obviously imply that even one pseudoexpander exists, while, for the purpose of the proof we need an infinite number of them. This is established in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *For each sufficiently large m there is a pseudoexpanderwith m roots and max-degree at most $m^{1/4.9}$. That is, there are infinitely many n for which there is a pseudoexpanderwith n vertices and the pseudodegree of each root being at most the number of roots to the power of $1/4.9$.*

Theorem 1 is proved in Section 4 using probabilistic method.

Corollary 1. *The elements of $\mathbf{\Phi}(\mathbf{PE})$ are monotone CNFs with linear number of clauses and there is an unbounded number of them. In particular, there is an unbounded number of ϕ_H where H is a pseudoexpanderwith m roots such that the pseudodegree of each root is at most $m^{1/4.9}$.*

We next define the formulas that will be associated with the computational paths as described in the overall intuition.

Definition 10 (Matching CNF). *Let M be a pseudomatching of $H \in \mathbf{BTB}$. A matching CNF w.r.t. M consists of clauses $C^{1/2}_{i,j}$ for each $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$, where $C^{1/2}_{i,j} \in \{V(P^{1/2}_{i\to j}), V(P^{1/2}_{j\to i})\}$.*
The set of all matching CNFs w.r.t. M is denoted by $\mathbf{CNF}(M)$.

Definition 11 (Matching OR-CNF). *An matching OR-CNF w.r.t. a pseudomatching M of $H \in \mathbf{BTB}$ has the form $Conj(S_1) \wedge \phi_1 \vee \cdots \vee Conj(S_q) \wedge \phi_q$, where $\{S_1, \ldots, S_q\}$ is the family of all sets of literals over $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$, $Conj(S_i)$ is the conjunction of literals of S_i and $\phi_i \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq q$. The set of all matching OR-CNFs w.r.t. M is denoted by $\mathbf{ORCNF}(M)$.*

We now define the special set of variables that appears in every computational path. Recall first that n and m denote the number of vertices of roots of H, respectively.

Definition 12 (Determining set). *Let Z be an NBP implementing ϕ_H for $H \in \mathbf{BTB}$. A set $X \subseteq V(Z)$ is called an* (a, b)-determining set *if $|X| \leq a$ and there are a pseudomatching M of H of size at least b and $\psi_X \in \mathbf{ORCNF}(M)$ such that for any computational path Q of Z containing X, $A(Q)$ satisfies ψ_X. We call ψ_X a* b-witnessing formula *for X.*

Theorem 2. *Let Z be an d-NBP implementing $\phi(H)$ for $H \in \mathbf{PE}$ with $d \leq \log n/10^5$. Then each computational path of Z contains a $(\log n/4000, m^{0.999}/3)$-determining set.*

Theorems 2 is proved in Section 5. The following theorem is based on the low probability of satisfaction of ψ_X for a $(\log n/4000, m^{0.999}/3)$-determining set X as described in the strategy of the proof.

Theorem 3. *There are constants $\alpha > 1$ and $0 < \gamma < 1$ such that the following holds. Let H be a pseudoexpander with a sufficiently large number of vertices and let $\psi_1 \ldots, \psi_q$ be OR-CNFs for which the following properties hold.*

- *For each ψ_i, there is a pseudomatching M_i of H of size at least $m^{0.999}/3$ such that $\psi_i \in \mathbf{ORCNF}(M_i)$.*
- *Every satisfying assignment of ϕ_H satisfies $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_q$.*

Then $q \geq \alpha^{n^\gamma}$.

Theorem 3 is proved in Section 6.

Theorem 4. *There exist constants $\alpha > 1$ and $0 < \beta < 1$ such that the following holds: if H is a sufficiently large pseudoexpander and Z a d-NBP computing ϕ_H with $d \leq \log n/10^5$, then $|Z| \geq \alpha^{n^\beta}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2, each computational path P contains $X(P)$ which is a $(\log n/4000, m^{0.999}/3)$-determining set. Let $\{X_1, \ldots, X_q\}$ be all such sets $X(P)$ and let $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_q$ be their respective $m^{0.999}/3$-witnessing formulas. That is there are pseudomatchings $M_1, \ldots M_q$ of H of size at least $m^{0.999}/3$ each such that $\psi_i \in \mathbf{ORCNF}(M_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$.

Next, we show that the disjunction of ψ_i is satisfied by every satisfying assignment of ϕ_H. Indeed, let S be a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H. Then there is a computational path P with $S = A(P)$. By the definition of $\{X_1, \ldots, X_q\}$, there is some X_i contained in P. It follows from Definition 12 that S satisfies ψ_i and hence the disjunction of $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_q$.

Thus both conditions of Theorem 3 are satisfied and it follows that $q \geq \alpha^{n^\gamma}$. for some $\alpha > 1$ and $0 < \gamma < 1$. As each X_i is of size at most $\log n/4000$, $q \leq |Z|^{\log n}$ and thus $|Z|^{\log n} \geq \alpha^{n^\gamma}$. Therefore, $|Z| \geq \alpha^{n^\beta}$ where $\beta = 0.99 * \gamma$. ■

The class of CNFs considered in Theorem 4 is non-constructive, its existence is established using the probabilistic method. In the following theorem, we prove existence of a poly-time deterministic procedure creating a class of monotone small CNFs such that for each sufficiently large CNF φ of this class there is a partial assignment transforming φ into ϕ_H for some pseudoexpander H of essentially the same size. Thus the lower bound of Theorem 4 applies to this constructively created class of CNFs.

Theorem 5. *There is a class of CNFs produced by a polynomial time deterministic procedure that takes an exponential size to compute by d-NBP for $d \leq \log n/10^5$*

The proof of Theorem 5 appears in the Appendix.

4 Proof of Theorem 1

In order to prove Theorem 1, we introduce a new type of graphs we call *pre-pseudoexpander*, which we define next. Afterwards we show that for each sufficiently large m there is a pre-pseudoexpander with m vertices. Then we prove Theorem 1 by showing that for a sufficiently large m there is a pre-pseudoexpander with m vertices that is the underlying graph of pseudoexpander with m roots.

Definition 13. ***[Pre-pseudoexpander]*** *An m vertex graph $G = (V, E)$ is a* pre-pseudoexpander *if it satisfies the following:*

1. *the maximal degree of a vertex in G does not exceed $m^{1/4.9}$, and*
2. *for every disjoint $V_1, V_2 \subseteq V$ such that $|V_1|, |V_2| \geq n^{0.999}$, there exists a matching in G, of size at least $m^{0.999}/2$, between V_1 and V_2.*

The proof that for each sufficiently large m there is a pre-pseudoexpander with m vertices consists of two parts: in the first part, we show that the existence of a pre-pseudoexpander follows from the existence of a graph with the small degree property (Condition 1) and a relaxation of the second property (Condition 2) from matching to single edges; and in the second part we use the probabilistic method to prove that such graphs with m vertices exist for each sufficiently large m.

Lemma 3. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph of m vertices. If for every disjoint $U_1, U_2 \subseteq V$ such that $|U_1|, |U_2| \geq m^{0.999}/2$, there exists an edge $\{u, v\}$ such that $u \in U_1$ and $v \in U_2$, then G satisfies Condition 2 of the definition of a pre-pseudoexpander.*

Proof. Assume for the sake of contradiction that there exist disjoint subsets $U_1, U_2 \subseteq V$, each of size at least $m^{0.999}$, such that every matching between them is of size less than $m^{0.999}/2$. Let W be the edges of a maximum matching between U_1 and U_2. Since the number of edges in W is less than $m^{0.999}/2$, $|U_i \setminus V(W)| > m^{0.999} - m^{0.999}/2 = m^{0.999}/2$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Consequently, there is an edge $\{u, v\}$ such that $u \in U_1 \setminus V(W)$ and $v \in U_2 \setminus V(W)$. Thus, $W \cup \{u, v\}$ is also a matching between U_1 and U_2. Since obviously, $W \cup \{u, v\}$ is larger than W we get a contradiction to W being a maximum matching between U_1 and U_2. □

Lemma 4. *There exists a constant c such that, for every m larger than c, there exists a m vertex graph $G = (V, E)$ that satisfies the following two conditions:*

1. *the maximal degree of a vertex in G does not exceed $m^{1/4.9}$, and*
2. *for every disjoint $U_1, U_2 \subseteq V$ such that $|U_1|, |U_2| \geq m^{0.999}/2$, there exists an edge $\{u, v\}$ such that $u \in U_1$ and $v \in U_2$.*

Proof. We construct a random graph and prove that with strictly positive probability it has the property that, for every pair of subsets $U_1, U_2 \subseteq V$ such that $|U_1|, |U_2| = \lceil m^{0.999}/2 \rceil$, there exists an edge $\{u, v\}$ such that $u \in U_1$ and $v \in U_2$. Thus, by the probabilistic method a graph with such a property exists. The statement of the lemma follows, because every set of size at least $m^{0.999}/2$ is a superset of a set of size exactly $\lceil m^{0.999}/2 \rceil$.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a random graph of n vertices such that, for every distinct $u, v \in V$, the edge $\{u, v\}$ is in E independently with probability $n^{-4/5}$. Let $|U_1|, |U_2| = \lceil m^{0.999}/2 \rceil$.

There are $|U_1| * |U_2| \geq m^{1.998}/9$ pairs $\{u, v\}$ such that $u \in U_1$ and $v \in U_2$ and hence, with probability at least

$$(1 - n^{-4/5})^{m^{1.998}/9} \leq e^{-n^{-4/5} * m^{1.998}/9} = e^{-m^{1.198}/9} \leq e^{-m^{1.197}},$$

there does not exist a single edge in E between a vertex in U_1 and a vertex in U_2. The number of pairs of disjoint subsets of V each of size exactly $\lceil m^{0.999}/2 \rceil$ is at most:

$$\binom{m}{m^{0.999}} * 2^{m^{0.999}} \leq m^{2 * m^{0.999}} * 2^{m^{0.999}} \leq 2^{\log m * 2 * m^{0.999}} * 2^{m^{0.999}} \leq 2^{m^{0.9991}} \leq e^{m^{0.9991}}.$$

Thus, by the union bound, with probability at least $1 - e^{m^{0.9991}} \cdot e^{-m^{1.197}} > 2/3$, for every pair of subsets $U_1, U_2 \subseteq V$ such that $|U_1|, |U_2| = \lceil m^{0.999}/2 \rceil$, there exists an edge $\{u, v\}$ such that $u \in U_1$ and $v \in U_2$.

Let v be an arbitrary vertex in G. By the Chernoff's bound, the probability that the degree of v is greater than $3n^{1/5}$ is at most $2e^{-m^{1/5}}$. Thus, by the union bound, with probability at least $1 - m * 2e^{-m^{1/5}} > 2/3$, for every $u \in V$, the degree of U is at most $3n^{1/5}$.

Finally, again by the union bound, with probability strictly greater than $1/3$, the random graph we defined has both properties required in the statement of the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 1 According to Lemma 4, for each sufficiently large m, there is a graph G'_m with m vertices, max-degree $m^{1/4.9}$ and with an edge between any two subsets of its vertices of size at least $m^{0.999}/2$. According to Lemma 3, G'_m is in fact pre-pseudoexpander.

We are going to construct a graph $H_m \in \mathbf{BTB}$ with m roots such that G'_m is isomorphic to $U(H_m)$, the underlying graph of H_m and with the height of each tree of $\mathbf{T}(H_m)$ being at most $\log m/4.9 + 3$. The construction is as follows. Enumerate the vertices of G'_m by $1, \ldots, m$. Fix extended trees $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ such that the number of leaves of T_i is exactly as d_i, the degree of vertex i in G'_m and the height of T'_i is at most $\log m/4.9 + 3$. It is not hard to see that such trees exist. Indeed, take a complete binary tree T' with at most $2 * m^{1/4.9}$ leaves, fix an arbitrary set L of $d_i \leq m^{1/4.9}$ leaves and let T'' be the rooted tree obtained by the union of all root-leaf paths of T' ending at L. The height of T'_i is at most $\log m/4.9 + 2$. By adding one leaf to each leaf of T'' we obtain an extended tree with d_i leaves and height at most $\log m/4.9 + 3$. Next for each $1 \leq i \leq m$ mark the leaves of T_i with the numbers assigned to the neighbour of vertex i in G'_m (each leaf is assigned with a unique number). Then for those pairs $\{i, j\}$ where T_i has a leaf ℓ_1 marked with i and T_j has a leaf ℓ_2 marked with j, identify ℓ_1 and ℓ_2. Let H_m be the resulting graph. A direct inspection shows that $U(H_m)$ is isomorphic to G'_m.

We next show that H_m will satisfy the large pseudomatching property. Indeed, let U_1, U_2 be two disjoint subsets of roots of H_m of size at least $m^{0.999}$ each. By the property of pre-pseudoexpanders, there is a matching of size at least $m^{0.999}/2 \geq m^{0.999}/3$ between U_1 and U_2. As in G'_m there is an edge between $u \in U_1$ and $v \in U_2$ if and only if in H_m there is a pseudoedge between these vertices in H_m, there is a pseudomatching of size at least $m^{0.999}/3$ between U_1 and U_2 in H_m. We conclude that H_m is a pseudoexpander with maximal pseudodegree at most $m^{1/4.9}$, thus implying the theorem. ■

5 Proof of Theorem 2

In this section, we prove that each computational path of a d-NBP Z with $d \leq \log n/10^5$ computing ϕ_H for $H \in \mathbf{PE}$, contains a $(\log n/4000, m^{0.999}/3)$-determining set X. We first show, using the structural theorem of Alon and Maass (Theorem 1.1. of [1]), that on each computational path P, there is a set X of size at most $\log n/4000$ that

separates two large disjoint sets Y_1 and Y_2 of roots of H in the following sense. We call Y_1 the *odd* set and Y_2 the *even* set. The set X naturally partitions P into subpaths enumerated along P so that the elements of the Y_1 occur as labels only on edges of odd numbered subpaths and elements of Y_2 occur only on even numbered subpaths. We then show that X is in fact a $(\log n/4000, m^{0.999}/3)$-determining set.

That is, we show the existence of a formula $\psi_X \in \mathbf{ORCNF}(M)$, where M is a pseudomatching of size at least $m^{0.999}/3$ such that every assignment carried by a computational path containing X satisfies ψ_X.

We fix a pseudomatching M between Y_1 and Y_2 such that $|M| \geq m^{0.999}/3$. The existence of M is guaranteed by the large pseudomatching property of pseudoexpanders. We consider an arbitrary assignment S to all the variables of ϕ_H except $\bigcup M$. We show that for each $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$, there is a 'half clause' $C'_{i,j} \in \{V(P^{1/2}_{i\to j}), V(P^{1/2}_{j\to i})\}$ satisfied by the assignment carried by every computational path P containing X with $S \subseteq A(P)$. We prove this by showing that otherwise there are computational paths Q' and Q'' both containing X and with $S \subseteq A(Q') \cap A(Q'')$ such that Q' falsifies one of these clauses and Q'' falsifies the other one. Then, because Z is a uniform d-NBP, Q' and Q'' can be 'combined' into a computational path Q^* falsifying $C_{i,j}$, in contradiction to the definition of Z. It follows that every assignment carried by a computational path P containing X with $S \subseteq A(P)$ satisfies $\varphi \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$ consisting of the half clauses $C'_{i,j}$ for $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$.

In the final stage of the proof, we set $\psi_X = Conj(S_1) \wedge \varphi_1 \vee \cdots \vee Conj(S_q) \wedge \varphi_q$, where $S_1, \ldots, S_q$ are all possible sets of literals assigning all the variables except $\bigcup M$ and $\varphi \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$ is determined regarding S_i as specified in the previous paragraph. We show that ψ_X is a $m^{0.999}/3$-witnessing formula for X. Indeed, let P be a path containing X. Due to the uniformity, there is $S_i \in A(P)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq q$ (that is $A(P)$ satisfies $Conj(S_i)$. Then, by definition of φ_i, $A(P)$ satisfies φ_i and hence $A(P)$ satisfies ψ_X, concluding the proof.

Definition 14 (Partition of a path and a generating set). *Let P be a path of Z. A sequence $P_1, \ldots, P_c$ of subpaths of P is a* partition *of P if P_1 is a prefix of P, for each $1 < i \leq c$, the first vertex of P_i is the last vertex of P_{i-1}, and P_c is a suffix of P.*

We say that the set X of ends of $P_1, \ldots, P_{c-1}$ generates *$P_1, \ldots, P_c$ on P.*

Definition 15 (Variable separators). *Let $X \subseteq V(Z)$ not containing the source nor the sink vertex of Z.*

We say that X separates *two disjoint subsets Y_1 and Y_2 of $Vars(Z)$ if there is a computational path P of Z passing through all the vertices of X such that one of the following two statements is true regarding the partition $P_1, \ldots, P_{|X|+1}$ generated by X on P.*

1. *Elements of Y_1 occur only on paths P_i with odd i and elements of Y_2 occur only on paths P_i with even i.*
2. *Elements of Y_1 occur only on paths P_i with even i and elements of Y_2 occur only on paths P_i with odd i.*

The proofs of the following two lemmas is provided in the Appendix.

Lemma 5. *On each computational path P of Z there is a set X of vertices size at most $\log n/4000$ that separates two disjoint subsets of $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$ of size at least $m^{0.999}$.*

Lemma 6. *Let Z be a d-NBP and let X be a subset of its vertices separating two disjoint subsets Y_1 and Y_2 of $Vars(Z)$. Let $Y_1' \subseteq Y_1$ and $Y_2' \subseteq Y_2$. Let S be an assignment to $Vars(Z) \setminus (Y_1 \cup Y_2)$ and Q' and Q'' be two computational paths of Z containing X such that $S \subseteq A(Q') \cap A(Q'')$, Q' assigns negatively all the variables of Y_1' and Q'' assigns negatively all the variables of Y_2'. Then there is a computational path Q^* of Z containing X with $S \subseteq A(Q^*)$ that assigns negatively all the variables of $Y_1' \cup Y_2'$.*

Lemma 7. *Let Z be a d-NBP computing ϕ_H. Let $X \subseteq V(Z)$ be a subset of vertices of Z separating subsets Y_1 and Y_2 of $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$ and let M be a pseudomatching of H between Y_1 and Y_2.*

Then for each set S of literals over $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ there is $\varphi \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$ such that for each path P containing X and with $S \subseteq A(P)$, φ is satisfied by $A(P)$.

Proof. Fix a set S of literals over $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$. For $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$, let $C^{1/2}_{i\to j}$ be clauses whose sets of literals are, respectively, $V(P^{1/2}_{i\to j})$ and $V(P^{1/2}_{j\to i})$.

We first show that for each $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$, there is $C'_{i,j} \in \{C^{1/2}_{i\to j}, C^{1/2}_{j\to i}\}$ such that for each path P containing X with $S \subseteq A(P)$, $C'_{i,j}$ is satisfied by $A(P)$.

Indeed, suppose this is not true. This means that there are two computational paths Q' and Q'' containing X with $S \subseteq A(Q') \cap A(Q'')$ such that Q' falsifies $C^{1/2}_{i\to j}$ and Q'' falsifies $C^{1/2}_{j\to i}$ (it is necessary that $Q' \neq Q''$ because otherwise Q' falsifies both $C^{1/2}_{i\to j}$ and $C^{1/2}_{i\to j}$ and hence the whole $C_{i,j}$, a contradiction). All the non-root variables of $C_{i,j}$ belong to $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ and hence occur in S. As Q'_1 falsifies $C^{1/2}_{i\to j}$, all the non-root variables of $C^{1/2}_{i\to j}$ occur negatively in S. Symmetrically, all the non-root variables of $C^{1/2}_{j\to i}$ occur negatively in S. Therefore, all the non-root variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur negatively in S. Assume w.l.o.g. that $t_i \in Y_1$ and $t_j \in Y_2$. Then, by Lemma 6, there is a computational path Q^* of Z passing through X with $S \subseteq A(Q)$ and both t_i and t_j occurring negatively. That is Q^* falsifies $C_{i,j}$ in contradiction to the definition of Z computing ϕ. Thus $C'_{i,j}$, as specified in the previous paragraph indeed exists.

It follows that each computational path P of Z containing X and with $S \subseteq A(P)$ satisfies the CNF φ whose clauses are $C'_{i,j}$, for every $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$. Clearly $\varphi \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$. ■

Proof of Theorem 2 Let P be a computational path of Z. By Lemma 5, P contains a set X of vertices of size at most $\log n/4000$ that separates two disjoint subsets Y_1 and Y_2 of $Roots(H)$ of size at least $m^{0.999}$ each.

By the large pseudomatching property of pseudoexpanders, there is a pseudomatching M of H between Y_1 and Y_2 with $|M| \geq m^{0.999}/3$.

Let $S_1, \ldots, S_q$ be all sets of literals over $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$. By Lemma 7, for each S_i there is $\varphi_i \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$ that is satisfied by $A(Q)$ for each computational path Q containing X provided that $S_i \subseteq A(Q)$.

Let $\psi = (Conj(S_1) \wedge \varphi_1) \vee \cdots \vee (Conj(S_q) \wedge \varphi_q)$. Clearly $\psi \in \mathbf{ORCNF}(M)$. It remains to show that ψ is satisfied by the assignment carried by each computational

path Q containing X. For this notice that $A(Q)$ necessarily contains some S_i (since Z is a uniform d-NBP, all the variables occur in $A(Q)$, hence this S_i is just the projection of $A(Q)$ to $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$). Therefore, by the previous paragraph, $A(Q)$ satisfies φ_i and hence also $Conj(S_i \wedge \varphi_i)$. Consequently, $A(Q)$ satisfies ψ. ■

6 Proof of Theorem 3

Recall that Theorem 3 states that if $M_1, \ldots, M_r$ are *large* pseudomatchings of $H \in \mathbf{PE}$ and $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_r$ are formulae such that $\psi_i \in \mathbf{ORCNF}(M_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$ and every satisfying assignment of ϕ_H satisfies one of $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_r$, then r is exponentially large. To prove this, we define a probability space over the set of satisfying assignments of ϕ_H. Then we fix a large matching M and $\psi \in \mathbf{ORCNF}(M)$ and show that the probability of satisfaction of ψ is exponentially small in $|M|$. By the union bound, Theorem 3 follows.

In order to prove the small probability of satisfaction of ψ we introduce a special property of sets of literals over $V(H) \setminus M$ and show that: (i) the probability of the satisfaction of ψ conditioned on this property is exponentially small in $|M|$ and (ii) the probability that this property is *not* satisfied is exponentially small in $|M|$. Thus the probability of satisfaction of ψ is upper bounded by the sum of these two exponentially small quantities and hence is exponentially small itself. We provide further informal explanation of the use of the above special property after it has been defined.

In this section we refer to the variables of ϕ_H that are root, leaf, and the rest of vertices of $V(H)$ as the *root*, *leaf*, and *internal* variables of ϕ_H, respectively. All sets of literals considered in this section are over subsets of variables of ϕ_H.

Definition 16 (Fixed set of literals.). *A literal $\ell_{i,j}$ (that is, the positive literal of the variable $\ell_{i,j}$ which is the joint leaf of trees T_i and T_j) is* fixed *w.r.t. a set S of literals if the following two conditions are true.*

- $\ell_{i,j} \in S$*;*
- *the rest of variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur negatively in S.*

We denote the set of fixed literals of S by $Fix(S)$.

Probability space for the set of satisfying assignments of H. Denote by $\mathbf{SAT}(H)$ the set of satisfying assignments of ϕ_H, which is the family of sets S of literals with $Var(S) = V(H)$ that satisfy ϕ_H. In this section we use the probability space with the sample space $\mathbf{SAT}(H)$ and for each $S \in \mathbf{SAT}(H)$, the probability of the elementary event $\{S\}$ is $(1/2)^{|S \setminus Fix(S)|} = (1/2)^{|V(H) \setminus Fix(S)|}$. In order to ensure that this definition is valid, we prove that the probabilities of elementary events sum up to 1.

Proposition 1 (Validity of the probability space). $\sum_{S \in \mathbf{SAT}(H)} (1/2)^{|S \setminus Fix(S)|} = 1$

The proof is postponed to the appendix.

The following is the main statement to be proved in this section.

Theorem 6. *There are constants $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $0 < \mu < 1$ such that for any sufficiently large $H \in \mathbf{PE}$ with $m = |\mathbf{Roots}(H)|$, any pseudomatching M of H of size at least $m^{0.999}/3$ and any $\psi \in \mathbf{ORCNF}(M)$, the probability that a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H satisfies ψ is at most λ^{m^μ}.*

Assuming that Theorem 6 holds, we can now prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $n = |V(H)|$. It is not hard to observe that $n \leq 3m^2$. Therefore, there is a constant $0 < \gamma < 1$ such that $\lambda^{m^\mu} \leq \lambda^{n^\gamma}$ and, hence, according to Theorem 6, the probability that a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H satisfies ψ at most λ^{n^γ}.

Let $\alpha = 1/\lambda$ and assume by contradiction that $|\mathbf{\Psi}| < \alpha^{n^\gamma}$. By the union bound, the probability that an assignment of ϕ_H satisfies one of the elements of $\mathbf{\Psi}$ is at most $|\mathbf{\Psi}| * \lambda^{n^\gamma} < 1$, the inequality follows from the assumption that there is a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H that does not satisfy any element of $\mathbf{\Psi}$, in contradiction to its definition. ■

In the rest of this section we prove Theorem 6.

Events. The events are subsets of $\mathbf{SAT}(H)$.

- **Containment event:** for a set S of literals, $\mathbf{EC}(S)$ denotes the set of all elements $S' \in \mathbf{SAT}(H)$ such that $S \subseteq S'$.
- **Satisfiability event:** for a formula φ, $\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)$ denotes the set of all elements of $S' \in \mathbf{SAT}(H)$ that satisfy φ.

The following lemma will allow us to move back and forth between the probability of the union of events and the sum of their probabilities.

Lemma 8. *Let S_1 and S_2 be two distinct sets of literals such that $Var(S_1) = Var(S_2)$. Then $\mathbf{EC}(S_1) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_2) = \emptyset$*

Proof. Suppose $S \in \mathbf{EC}(S_1) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_2)$. Then the projection of S to $Var(S_1)$ is both S_1 and S_2, which is impossible since $S_1 \neq S_2$. ■

Definition 17 (Siblings in H). *Two internal vertices u and v of H are* siblings *if they belong to the same tree T_i and if u and v are siblings in T_i.*

(This definition is unambiguous because each internal vertex belongs to exactly one tree of $\mathbf{T}(H)$.

Definition 18 (Set of literals respecting a pseudoedge). *A set S of literals* respects *a pseudoedge $\{t_i, t_j\}$ if the following two conditions hold.*

1. *All non-root variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur negatively in S.*
2. *The siblings of all internal variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur positively in S.*

Definition 19 (η-comfortable set of literals). *For $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, a set S of literals is* η-comfortable *w.r.t. a pseudomatching M if the following two conditions hold.*

1. *S does not falsify any clause of ϕ_H*

2. S respects at least $\eta * |M|$ pseudoedges of M.

We continue the informal explanation started in the beginning of this section. The special property on sets of assignments S over $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ mentioned there is that S is η-comfortable w.r.t. M for $\eta = c * m^{-4/4.9}$ for a specially chosen constant c. We prove that (i) if S is η-comfortable w.r.t. M then for any $\varphi \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$, $Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)|\mathbf{EC}(S)) \leq (2/3)^{\eta * |M|}$ and (ii) the probability that an element of $\mathbf{SAT}(H)$ is not η-comfortable is exponentially small in $|M|$.

The proof of (i) is, essentially, a reduction from the following: (iii) if S is an assignment of $V(H) \setminus M$ that is 1-comfortable w.r.t. M then $Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)|\mathbf{EC}(S)) \leq (2/3)^{|M|}$. To prove (iii), we note S assigns all the variables of ϕ_H except the root variables of $C_{i,j}$ for $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$. Moreover, by Definition 18, all the non-root variables of each such $C_{i,j}$ are assigned negatively. Therefore, for each such $C_{i,j}$, either t_i or t_j is assigned positively, thus making 3 choices per clause and the total number of possible elements of $\mathbf{EC}(S)$ being at most $3^{|M|}$. It may seem that some choices are not available because negative assignment to some t_i, together with S, could falsify clauses corresponding to pseudoedges that are not in M. However, this does not happen since positive assignments to siblings of internal variables of $C_{i,j}$ eliminate such a possibility, so the number of elements of $\mathbf{EC}(S)$ is indeed $3^{|M|}$.

Moreover, we show that each element of $\mathbf{EC}(S)$ has the same set of fixed literals and has the same probability. Therefore, proving (iii) amounts to proving that at most $2^{|M|}$ elements of $\mathbf{EC}(S)$ satisfy φ.

In order to show this, recall that $\varphi \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$ consists of 'halves' of clauses $C_{i,j}$ for $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$. Hence every element of $\mathbf{EC}(S)$ satisfying φ must satisfy all the root variables of these halves, leaving 2 choices per clause (either positive or negative assignment of the other root variable) and the total number of choices is at most $2^{|M|}$ as required.

To prove statement (ii) we define for each $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$ a $1-0$ random variable $X_{i,j}$ which is 1 exactly on those elements of $\mathbf{SAT}(H)$ that respect $\{t_i, t_j\}$. We then prove that (iv) the probability that $X_{i,j} = 1$ is at most $c_1 * m^{-4/4.9}$ for some constant c_1 and that (v) the variables $X_{i,j}$ are mutually independent. By Chernnoff's bound, with high probability, an element of $\mathbf{SAT}(H)$ respects at least $c * m^{-4/4.9} * |M|$ edges of M where c is a constant dependent on c_1 (and we choose $\eta = c * m^{-4/4.9}$), thus implying (ii).

For statement (iv), note that because of the small height property of pseudoexpanders, each clause $C_{i,j}$ of ϕ_H has about $2 \log m/4.9$ variables. Together with about the same number of siblings of internal variables of $C_{i,j}$, this means that assignments of about $4 \log m/4.9$ variables of ϕ_H must be fixed in an element of $\mathbf{SAT}(H)$ in order to respect $\{t_i, t_j\}$. Although, due to 'non-uniform' character of the probability space, some careful calculation is required, this is, essentially the reason why the probability of respecting $t_{i,j}$ is $O(2^{-4 \log m/4.9}) = m^{-4/4.9}$.

The underlying reason for statement (v) is that respecting of two distinct pseudoedges of a pseudomatching requires fixing assignments on *disjoint* sets of variables of ϕ_H (though, again, in the considered probability space, this implication is not trivial and requires a careful calculation).

The statement (i) is Theorem 7. and it is proved in Subsection 6.1. The statements (iv) and (v) are Theorem 8. whose proof is provided in Subsection 6.2. We now show how Theorem 6 follows from (i) and (ii).

The proof of Theorem 6 amounts to showing that $\sum_{i=1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i))$ is exponentially small, where $S_1, \ldots, S_q$ are all possible assignments over $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ and $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_q$ are elements of $\mathbf{CNF}(M)$ such that $\psi = \bigvee_{i=1}^{q}(Conj(S_i) \wedge \varphi_i)$. Because of the possibility of rearrangement, we can assume w.l.o.g. that for some $r \leq q$, $S_1, \ldots, S_r$ are η-comfortable w.r.t. M while $S_{r+1}, \ldots, S_q$ are not. Then $\sum_{i=r+1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i))$ is exponentially small by (ii) and $\sum_{i=1}^{r} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) | \mathbf{EC}(S_i)) * Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_i))$. All the conditional probabilities are exponentially small according to (i), therefore, the last quantity can be upper bounded by a number exponentially small in $|M|$ multiplied by $\sum_{i=1}^{r} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_i)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_i)) = 1$. Thus as stated in the beginning of this section, $Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\psi))$ can be upper bounded by the sum of two exponentially small quantities.

Lemma 9. *A satisfying assignment S of ϕ_H is η-comfortable w.r.t. a pseudomatching M of H if and only if the projection S' of S to $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ is η-comfortable w.r.t. M.*

Proof. Assume S is η-comfortable w.r.t. M. By definition, this means that S contains particular occurrences of variables *all of which are non-root ones*. Since $\bigcup M$ consists of root variables only, these occurrences are preserved in S'. Therefore, S' is η-comfortable w.r.t. M.

Conversely, if S' is η-comfortable w.r.t. M then the witnessing occurrences of variables remain in any superset of S', in particular in S. As S does not falsify any clause, we conclude that S is η-comfortable w.r.t. M. ■

Theorem 7. *Let M be a pseudomatching of H, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$. Then for any set S of literals over $(V(H) \setminus \bigcup M)$, which is η-comfortable w.r.t. to M and for any $\varphi \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$, $Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi) | \mathbf{EC}(S)) \leq (2/3)^{\eta * |M|}$.*

The proof is provided in Subsection 6.1

Indicator variables for pseudoedges and their sums. Let $\{t_i, t_j\}$ be a pseudoedge of H. The indicator variable $X_{i,j}$ is a $1-0$ variable such that for $S \in \mathbf{SAT}(H)$, $X_{i,j}(S) = 1$ if and only if S respects $\{t_i, t_j\}$.

For a pseudomatching M of H, let $X_M = \sum_{\{t_i,t_j\} \in M} X_{i,j}$.

Theorem 8 (Statements about indicator variables.).

1. *For any pseudoedge $\{t_i, t_j\}$ of H, $Pr(X_{i,j} = 1) \geq 3/128 * m^{-4/4.9}$.*
2. *For any pseudomatching M, the variables $\{X_{i,j} | \{t_i, t_j\} \in M\}$ are mutually independent.*

The proof appears in Subsection 6.2.

Lemma 10. *Let M be a pseudomatching of H and $\eta = 3/12800 * m^{-4/4.9}$. Then $Pr(X_M < \eta * |M|) \leq 0.4^{100 * \eta * |M|}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 8, the variables $\{X_{i,j} | \{t_i, t_j\} \in M\}$ are mutually independent, which allows us to use Chernoff's bounds.

For this, we first calculate a lower bound on the expected value of X_M.

$$E[X_M] = \sum_{\{t_i,t_j\} \in M} E[X_{i,j}] = \sum_{\{t_i,t_j\} \in M} Pr(X_{i,j} = 1) \geq 100 * \eta * |M| \quad (1)$$

where the last inequality follows from Theorem 8 stating that $Pr(X_{i,j} = 1) \geq 100 * \eta$.

To apply Chernoff's bounds, we use inequality (4.4.) of Theorem 4.5. of [9]. We provide it here for convenience, adapted to our notation

$$Pr(X_M \leq (1 - \delta) * E[X_M]) \leq \left(\frac{e^{-\delta}}{(1-\delta)^{1-\delta}} \right)^{E[X_M]} \quad (2)$$

for any $0 < \delta < 1$. Now, we obtain the following.

$$Pr(X_M < \eta * |M|) \leq Pr(X_M \leq E[X_M]/100) = \\ Pr(X_M \leq (1 - 99/100) * E[X_M]) \leq 0.4^{E[X_M]} \leq 0.4^{100*\eta*|M|} \quad (3)$$

where the first inequality follows from (1) and the obvious fact that $Pr(X_M < E[X_M]/100) \leq Pr(X_M \leq E[X_M]/100)$, the second inequality follows from substituting 0.99 to δ in (2) and the inequality $\frac{e^{-0.99}}{0.01^{0.01}} \leq 0.4$ verified by a straightforward calculation, the third inequality follows from (1). ■

Proof of Theorem 6. By definition $\psi = Conj(S_1) \wedge \varphi_1 \vee \cdots \vee Conj(S_q) \wedge \varphi_q$, where $S_1, \ldots, S_q$ are sets of literals over $(V(H) \setminus \bigcup M)$ and $\varphi_i \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$.

Observe that

$$\mathbf{ES}(\psi) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} [\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)] \quad (4)$$

Indeed, assume $S \in \mathbf{ES}(\psi)$. Then S satisfies one of the conjuncts of ψ. Hence, there is $1 \leq i \leq q$ such that $S \in \mathbf{ES}(Conj(S_i) \wedge \varphi_i)$. Therefore, S satisfies *both* $Conj(S_i)$ and φ_i. Thus, $S \in \mathbf{ES}(Conj(S_i)) \cap \mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i)$. To satisfy a conjunction of literals, S must contain all these literals, as a result $S \in \mathbf{EC}(S_i)$. Consequently, $S \in \mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)$ and hence $S \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} [\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)]$.

Conversely, assume that $S \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} [\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)]$. Then $S \in \mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq q$. Since S contains all the literals of S_i, S satisfies the conjunction of these literals. Therefore, $S \in \mathbf{ES}(Conj(S_i))$. Since S satisfies both φ_i and $Conj(S_i)$, S also satisfies their conjunction. Consequently, $S \in \mathbf{ES}(Conj(S_i) \wedge \varphi_i)$. Finally, since $Conj(S_i) \wedge \varphi_i$ is a disjunct of ψ, we conclude that $S \in \mathbf{ES}(\psi)$.

Set $\eta = 3/12800 * m^{-4/4.9}$. Assume w.l.o.g., because of the possibility of rearrangement, that $S_1, \ldots, S_r$ are the η-comfortable w.r.t. M and $S_{r+1}, \ldots, S_q$ are not η-comfortable.

Then

$$Pr(\mathbf{EC}(\psi)) = Pr(\bigcup_{i=1}^{q}[\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)]) = \sum_{i=1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)) + \sum_{i=r+1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)) \quad (5)$$

where the first equality follows from (4). For the second equality, notice that by Lemma 8, $\mathbf{EC}(S_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$ are mutually disjoint. Thereofre, $\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i))$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$ are also mutually disjoint and hence the probability of their union can be replaced by the sum of their probabilities. The third equality is correct because the right-hand part of its is a regrouping of items in the left-hand part.

We are now, going to show that both $\sum_{i=1}^{r} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i))$ and $\sum_{i=r+1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i))$ are exponentially small from where the theorem will immediately follow.

For the former,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^{r}[Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i)|\mathbf{EC}(S_i)) * Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_i)] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{r}[(2/3)^{\eta*|M|} * Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_i)] = (2/3)^{\eta*|M|} * Pr(\bigcup_{i=1}^{r} \mathbf{EC}(S_i)) \leq (2/3)^{\eta*|M|} \quad (6)$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of conditional probability and the first inequality follows from Theorem 7. The second equality is the result of moving $(2/3)^{\eta*|M|}$ out of the brackets and replacing the sum of probabilities by the probability of union, the replacement enabled by Lemma 8 (see the explanation to (5) for the detailed justification). Finally, the second inequality holds because $Pr(\bigcup_{i=1}^{r} \mathbf{EC}(S_i)) \leq 1$.

In order to establish an exponentially small lower bound on $\sum_{i=r+1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i))$, the key observation is the following.

$$\bigcup_{i=r+1}^{q} \mathbf{EC}(S_i) = \{S'|(S' \in \mathbf{SAT}(H)) \wedge (X_M(S') < \eta * |M|)\} \quad (7)$$

Indeed, assume that $S \in \bigcup_{i=r+1}^{q} \mathbf{EC}(S_i)$. Then, $S_i \subseteq S$ for some $r+1 \leq i \leq q$. By our assumption, S_i is not η-comfortable w.r.t. M. Hence, as S is a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H S is not η-comfortable w.r.t. M according to Lemma 9.

As S is a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H, the only way for S to be not η-comfortable is to respect less than $\eta * |M|$ pseudoedges $\{t_i, t_j\}$ of M. Consequently, less than $\eta * |M|$ corresponding variables $X_{i,j}$ equal 1 on S and hence $X_M(S) < \eta * |M|$. That is, $S \in \{S'|(S' \in \mathbf{SAT}(H)) \wedge (X_M(S') < \eta * |M|)\}$.

Conversely, assume that $S \in \{S'|(S' \in \mathbf{SAT}(H)) \wedge (X_M(S') < \eta * |M|)\}$ That is, $X_M(S) < \eta * |M|$. Hence less than $\eta * |M|$ variables $\{X_{i,j}|\{t_i, t_j\} \in M\}$ are 1 on S, that is, in turn, S respects less than $\eta * |M|$ pseudoedges of M, hence S is not η-comfortable w.r.t. M. As S is a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H, the projection S^* of S to

$V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ is not η-comfortable by Lemma 9. By assumption, there is $r+1 \leq i \leq q$ such that $S_i = S^*$. Hence, $S \in \mathbf{EC}(S_i)$ as required.

Now, we obtain the following:

$$\sum_{i=r+1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i)) \leq \sum_{i=r+1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_i)) =$$

$$Pr(\bigcup_{i=r+1}^{q} \mathbf{EC}(S_i)) = Pr(\{S' | (S' \in \mathbf{SAT}(H)) \wedge (X_M(S') < \eta * |M|)\}) =$$

$$Pr(X_M < \eta * |M|) \leq 0.4^{100*\eta*|M|} \quad (8)$$

For the first inequality, note that for each $r+1 \leq i \leq q$, $\mathbf{ES}(\varphi_i) \cap \mathbf{EC}(S_i) \subseteq \mathbf{EC}(S_i)$, hence the probability of the event on the left-hand side does not exceed the probability of the event on the right-hand side. The first equality follows from Lemma 8 (see the explanation to (5) for the detailed justification). The second equality is just (7). The third equality is just an effect of changing notation for the probability of the same event. The fourth inequality follows from Lemma 10.

By substituing (6) and (8) into the last item of (5) and then, by substituting the value of η and the assumed lower bound of $|M|$, we obtain the following.

$$Pr(\mathbf{EC}(\psi)) \leq (2/3)^{\eta*|M|} + 0.4^{100*\eta*|M|} \leq$$

$$(2/3)^{3/12800*m^{-4/4.9}*m^{0.999}/3} + (0.4)^{100*3/12800*m^{-4/4.9}*m^{0.999}/3} \quad (9)$$

Let $\mu = 0.999 - 4/4.9$. Clearly, $0 < \mu < 1$ and there is λ such that, for a sufficiently large m, $Pr(\mathbf{EC}(\psi)) \leq \lambda^{m^\mu}$. ■

6.1 Proof of Theorem 7

Referring to the informal explanation provided after Definition 19, Theorem 7 is statement (i). The proof strategy outlined there is implemented in this section as follows.

Using the next lemma we will be able to conclude that if S is a partial assignment on $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ that is 1-comfortable for M, then all $3^{|M|}$ elements of $\mathbf{EC}(S)$ are satisfying assignments of ϕ_H. Next, Lemma 12 states that all these elements have the same probability. After that, in Lemma 13, we establish the claim of Theorem 7 for $\eta = 1$ and then, in the actual proof of Theorem 7, we do 'reduction' to an arbitrary η.

Lemma 11. *Let M be a pseudomatching and let S be a partial assignment on $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ that is 1-comfortable for M (that is, S does not falsify any clause of ϕ_H and respects all the pseudoedges of M). Let $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$ and let $\{t_i, t_{j'}\} \neq \{t_i, t_j\}$ be another pseudoedge of H (not contained in M due to having a joint end with $\{t_i, t_j\}$). Then S assigns positively at least one internal variable of $C_{i,j'}$.*

Proof. The root t_i of T_i is a common ancestor of $\ell_{i,j}$ and of $\ell_{i,j'}$. Therefore, we can identify the *lowest* common ancestor u of $\ell_{i,j}$ and $\ell_{i,j'}$ in T_i. Then u has two children v and w (if it had one child that child would be a common ancestor of $\ell_{i,j}$ and $\ell_{i,j'}$ in contradiction to being u the lowest one. Assume w.l.o.g. that v is an ancestor of $l_{i,j}$.

Then v belongs to $P_{i,j}$, hence v is a variable of $C_{i,j}$. As v is not a root variable (due to having a parent), v occurs negatively in S. Notice that $v \neq \ell_{i,j}$ because v has a sibling in T_i while $\ell_{i,j}$ does not. Therefore, v is an internal variable of $C_{i,j}$ and hence its sibling w occurs positively in S.

Observe that w is an ancestor of $\ell_{i,j'}$. Indeed, otherwise, v is an ancestor of $\ell_{i,j'}$ in contradiction to u being the lowest common ancestor of $\ell_{i,j}$ and $\ell_{i,j'}$. This means that w belongs to $P_{i,j'}$ and hence w is a variable of $C_{i,j'}$. Furthermore, $w \neq \ell_{i,j'}$ because w has a sibling v while $\ell_{i,j'}$ does not have siblings. As $w \neq t_i$ due to having a parent, we conclude that w is an internal variable of $C_{i,j'}$ assigned positively by S, as required. ■

Lemma 12. *Let M be a pseudomatching and let S be a partial assignment on $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ that is 1-comfortable for M. Then for every $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S)$, $Pr(\{S'\}) = 1/2^{|V(H) \setminus Fix(S)|}$*

Proof. By definition, $Pr(\{S'\}) = 1/2^{|V(H) \setminus Fix(S')|}$. We are going to show that $Fix(S) = Fix(S')$.

Assume that $\ell_{i,j} \in Fix(S)$. This means that S occurs positively in S and the rest of variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur negatively in S. As $S \subseteq S'$, all these occurrences are preserved in S' and hence $\ell_{i,j} \in Fix(S')$. That is $Fix(S) \subseteq Fix(S')$.

Conversely, assume that $\ell_{i,j} \in Fix(S')$. Then $\{t_i, t_j\} \notin M$. Indeed, otherwise, as S respects $\{t_i, t_j\}$, $\ell_{i,j}$ is assigned negatively in S and hence in S' in contradiction to the assumption that $\ell_{i,j} \in Fix(S')$.

Furthermore, it cannot happen that $|\{t_i, t_j\} \cap \bigcup M| = 1$. Indeed, otherwise, there is a pseudoedge, say $\{t_i, t'_j\} \in M$ such that $\{t_i, t_j\} \neq \{t_i, t'_j\}$. Then, by Lemma 11, at least one non-leaf variable of $C_{i,j}$ is assigned positively by S and hence by S'. However, this is a contradiction to $\ell_{i,j} \in Fix(S')$ requiring all the non-leaf variables of $C_{i,j}$ to be assigned negatively.

It remains to assume that $\{t_i, t_j\} \cap \bigcup M = \emptyset$. But in this case all the variables of $C_{i,j}$ are contained in $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ and hence occur in S. In particular, $\ell_{i,j}$ occurs positively in S and the rest of variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur negatively in S. It follows that $\ell_{i,j} \in Fix(S)$. That is $Fix(S') \subseteq Fix(S)$. ■

Lemma 13. *Let M be a pseudomatching and let S be a partial assignment on $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M$ that is 1-comfortable for M. Let $\varphi \in \mathbf{CNF}(M)$. Then $Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)|\mathbf{EC}(S)) = (2/3)^{|M|}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{SA}$ be the set of all extensions of S to $V(H)$ such that for each $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$, at least one of t_i, t_j occurs positively in S. Observe that

$$\mathbf{EC}(S) = \mathbf{SA} \tag{10}$$

Indeed, let $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S)$. Then S' is a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H. In particular, for each $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$, the clause $C_{i,j}$ is satisfied. However, all the variables of $C_{i,j}$, except the root ones occur negatively in S and hence in S'. It follows that, to satisfy $C_{i,j}$, at least one of root variables t_i, or t_j must occur positively in S'. Consequently (taking into account that S' is an extension of S), $S' \in \mathbf{SA}$ and hence $\mathbf{EC}(S) \subseteq \mathbf{SA}$.

Conversely, assume that $S' \in \mathbf{SA}$. To show that $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S)$, we need to demonstrate that S' is a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H.

For each $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$, the clause $C_{i,j}$ is satisfied because, by definition of $\mathbf{SA}$, at least one of t_i, t_j occurs positively in S'. Consider a clause $C_{i,j'}$ such that $i \in \bigcup M$ while $j' \notin \bigcup M$. By Lemma 11, at least one variable of $C_{i,j'}$ occurs positively in S and hence in S', satisfying $C_{i,j'}$. Finally consider a clause $C_{i,j}$ such that none of t_i, t_j occur in $\bigcup M$. This means that all the variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur in S. As S is 1-comfortable for M, S does not falsify $C_{i,j}$ and, since S contains literals of all the variables of $C_{i,j}$, S must *satisfy* $C_{i,j}$ and hence so is S'. Consequently, $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S)$ and hence $\mathbf{SA} \subseteq \mathbf{EC}(S)$.

As $\mathbf{SA}$ allows three independent choices per clause corresponding to a pseudoedge of M, we conclude that:

$$|\mathbf{SA}| = 3^{|M|} \tag{11}$$

Now, we are ready to obtain an expression for the probability of $\mathbf{EC}(S)$.

$$Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) = \sum_{S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S)} Pr(\{S'\}) = \sum_{S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S)} (1/2)^{|V(H) \setminus Fix(S)|} = (1/2)^{|V(H) \setminus Fix(S)|} * |\mathbf{EC}(S)| = (1/2)^{|V(H) \setminus Fix(S)|} * |\mathbf{SA}| = (1/2)^{|V(H) \setminus Fix(S)|} * 3^{|M|} \tag{12}$$

where the second equality follows from definition of the probability of an event, the second equality follows from Lemma 12, the third equality a straightforward algebraic transformation, the fourth equality follows from (10), the fifth equality follows from (11).

Recall, that by definition of $\mathbf{CNF}(M)$, the clauses $C_{i,j}^{1/2}$ of φ correspond to the pseudoedges $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$. In particular, the clause $C_{i,j}^{1/2}$ is a subclause of $C_{i,j}$ whose variables are either $V(P_{i \leftarrow j}^{1/2})$ or $V(P_{j \leftarrow i}^{1/2})$. That is, either the vertices of the path from t_i to $\ell_{i,j}$ in T_i or of the path from t_j to $\ell_{i,j}$ in T_j. By construction, $C_{i,j}^{1/2}$ contains exactly one vertex of $\{t_i, t_j\}$. Denote this vertex by $root(i, j)$.

Let $\mathbf{SB}$ be the set of all extensions S' of S to $V(H)$ such that for each $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$, $root(i, j)$ occurs positively in S'.

$$\mathbf{EC}(S) \cap \mathbf{ES}(\varphi) = \mathbf{SB} \tag{13}$$

Indeed, let $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S) \cap \mathbf{ES}(\varphi)$. This means that S' is an extension of S and satisfies $C_{i,j}^{1/2}$ for all $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$. For each $C_{i,j}^{1/2}$ all the non-root vairables occur negatively in S and hence so in S'. That is, the only way for S' to satisfy $C^{1/2}$ is to contain the positively occurrence of $root(i, j)$. Hence, $S' \in \mathbf{SB}$, and therefore $\mathbf{EC}(S) \cap \mathbf{ES}(\varphi) \subseteq \mathbf{SB}$. Conversely, suppose $S' \in \mathbf{SB}$. Then S' is an extension of S to $V(H)$ in which for each $\{t_i, t_j\}$, at least one variable occurs positively, namely $root(i, j)$. This means that $S' \in \mathbf{SA}$ and hence $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S)$ according to (10). Moreover, because of the positive occurrence of $root(i, j)$, for each $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$, S' satisfies all the clauses $C_{i,j}^{1/2}$ and hence S' satisfies φ. Consequently, $S' \in \mathbf{ES}(\varphi)$. That is, $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S) \cap \mathbf{ES}(\varphi)$ and hence $\mathbf{SB} \subseteq \mathbf{EC}(S) \cap \mathbf{ES}(\varphi)$. The correctness proof for (13) is now complete.

Since an element of $\mathbf{SB}$ can be formed by two independent choices per clause corresponding to an element of M, we conclude that

$$|\mathbf{SB}| = 2^{|M|} \tag{14}$$

$$Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)\cap\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)) = \sum_{S'\in\mathbf{EC}(S)\cap\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)} Pr(\{S'\}) = \sum_{S'\in\mathbf{EC}(S)\cap\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)} (1/2)^{|V(H)\setminus Fix(S)|} = (1/2)^{|V(H)\setminus Fix(S)|} * |\mathbf{EC}(S)\cap\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)| = (1/2)^{|V(H)\setminus Fix(S)|} * |\mathbf{SB}| = (1/2)^{|V(H)\setminus Fix(S)|} * 2^{|M|} \tag{15}$$

where the reasoning is analogous to (12) with (13) is used instead (10) and (14) is used instead of (11).

Now, with (12) and (15) in mind we obtain the following.

$$Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)|\mathbf{EC}(S)) = Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)\cap\mathbf{ES}(\varphi))/Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) = ((1/2)^{|V(H)\setminus Fix(S)|} * 2^{|M|})/((1/2)^{|V(H)\setminus Fix(S)|} * 3^{|M|}) = (2/3)^{|M|} \tag{16}$$

■

Proof of Theorem 7. Let M' be a subset of M consisting of at least $\eta * |M|$ pseudoedges respected by S. Let φ' be the sub-CNF of φ consisting of the clauses $C^{1/2}_{i,j}$ of φ corresponding to all the pseudoedges $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M'$. Clearly $\varphi' \in \mathbf{CNF}(M')$.

Let $\mathbf{S}$ be the set of all extensions of S to $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M'$ that do not falsify any clause. Observe that

$$\mathbf{EC}(S) = \bigcup_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{EC}(S^*) \tag{17}$$

Indeed, assume that $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S)$. Then the projection S^* of S' to $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M'$ is an extension of S to $V(H) \setminus \bigcup M'$ that does not falsify any clauses of ϕ_H, because S' does not falsify any. Therefore, $S^* \in \mathbf{S}$. Clearly, $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S^*) \subseteq \bigcup_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{EC}(S^*)$

For the opposite direction, let $S' \in \bigcup_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{EC}(S^*)$. Then there is $S^* \in \mathbf{S}$ such that $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S^*)$. As $S \subseteq S^*$, clearly, $\mathbf{EC}(S^*) \subseteq \mathbf{ES}(S)$. Consequently, $S \in \mathbf{EC}(S)$.

Observe that each $S^* \in \mathbf{S}$ respects each pseudoedge $\{t_i, t_j\}$ of M'. Indeed, S respects $\{t_i, t_j\}$ by assumption and, since $S \subseteq S^*$, all literal occurrences witnessing that S respects $\{t_i, t_j\}$ are retained in S^*. Since S^* does not falsify any clause of ϕ_H, S^* is 1-comfortable w.r.t. M'. Consequently, by Lemma 13,

$$\forall S^* \in \mathbf{S}, Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi')|\mathbf{EC}(S^*)) = (2/3)^{|M'|} \tag{18}$$

Now we obtain the following.

$$Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)\cap\mathbf{EC}(S)) \le Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi')\cap\mathbf{EC}(S)) = Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi')\cap \bigcup_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{EC}(S^*)) =$$

$$Pr(\bigcup_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} (\mathbf{ES}(\varphi')\cap\mathbf{EC}(S^*))) = \sum_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi')\cap\mathbf{EC}(S^*)) =$$

$$\sum_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} (Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi')|\mathbf{EC}(S^*))*Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S^*)) = \sum_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} ((2/3)^{|M'|}*Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S^*)) = (2/3)^{|M'|}*Pr(\bigcup_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{EC}(S^*)) =$$

$$(2/3)^{|M'|} * Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) \le (2/3)^{\eta^*|M|} * Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) \quad (19)$$

where the first inequality is correct because, due to φ' being a sub-CNF of φ, any satisfying assignment of φ is also a satisfying assignment of φ'. The first equality follows from (17). The second equality is a standard set-theoretic transformation. The third equality follows from Lemma 8 applied to the elements of $\mathbf{S}$. The fourth equality follows from definition of conditional probability. The fifth equality follows from Lemma 13. The sixth equality is a result of moving $(2/3)^{|M'|}$ outside the brackets and the replacement of $\sum_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S^*))$ by $Pr(\bigcup_{S^*\in\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{EC}(S^*))$ allowed by Lemma 8. Finally, the second inequality follows from definition of $|M'|$.

Thus (19) derives that $Pr(\mathbf{ES}(\varphi)\cap\mathbf{EC}(S)) \le (2/3)^{\eta^*|M|}*Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S))$. The theorem immediately follows from dividing both parts of this inequality by $Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S))$. ■

6.2 Proof of Theorem 8

Recall that Theorem 8 consists of two statements. The first one states that $Pr(X_{i,j}) \ge 3/128*m^{-4/4.9}$, for every pseudoedge $\{t_i, t_j\} \in H$. The second statement claims that, for every pseudomatching M of H, the variables $X_{i,j}$ for pseudoedges $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M$ are mutually independent.

For a pseudoedge $\{t_i, t_j\}$, denote by $S_{i,j}$ the set of literals consisting of negative literals of all the non-root variables of $C_{i,j}$ and positive literals for all the siblings of the internal variables of $C_{i,j}$.

It follows from the definition of $X_{i,j}$ that

Observation 1. $Pr(X_{i,j} = 1) = Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_{i,j})$.

Definition 20 (Guarded set of literals). *A set S of literals is* guarded *from a clause $C_{i,j}$ of ϕ_H if one of the following three conditions holds.*

1. *$\ell_{i,j}$ does not occur in S.*
2. *A non-leaf variable of $C_{i,j}$ occurs positively in S.*
3. *$\ell_{i,j}$ occurs positively in S and the rest of variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur negatively in S.*

Lemma 14. *Let S be a guarded set if literals. Then $Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) = 2^{-|S\setminus Fix(S)|}$.*

The proof of Lemma 14 appears in Section 6.3.

We show that $Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_{i,j})$ can be represented as the sum of probabilities of $\mathbf{EC}$-events for guarded set of literals. Denote the set $\{S_{i,j} \cup \{t_i, t_j\}, S_{i,j} \cup \{\neg t_i, t_j\}, S_{i,j} \cup \{t_i, \neg t_j\}\}$ by $\mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}$.

Lemma 15. *1. Each $S \in \mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}$ is guarded with $Fix(S) = \emptyset$.*

2. $Pr(X_{i,j} = 1) = Pr(\cup_{S \in \mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}} \mathbf{EC}(S)) = \sum_{S \in \mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S))$.

Proof. S is guarded from $C_{i,j}$ because at least one of t_i, t_j occurs positively and hence the second condition of Definition 20 is satisfied. No leaf variable except $\ell_{i,j}$ occurs in S hence, S is guarded from the rest of the clauses according to the first condition of Definition 20. As S does not contain positive literals of leaf variables, it does not contain fixed literals.

The second equality of the second statement immediately follows from Lemma 8. In light of Observation 1, for the first equality it is enough to show that $\mathbf{EC}(S_{i,j}) = \cup_{S \in \mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}} \mathbf{EC}(S)$. Indeed, let $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S_{i,j})$. As S' is a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H, at least one variable of $C_{i,j}$ must occur positively in S'. As all the non-root variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur negatively in $S_{i,j}$ and hence in S', at least one root variable of $C_{i,j}$ (either t_i or t_j) must occur positively in S'. Therefore, there is $S \in \mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}$ such that $S \subseteq S'$. Conversely, if $S' \in \cup_{S \in \mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}} \mathbf{EC}(S)$, then $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S)$ for some $S \in \mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}$ and therefore $S \subseteq S'$. Now as $S_{i,j} \subseteq S$, we conclude that $S_{i,j} \subseteq S'$. ■

The combination of Lemma 14 and Lemma 15 allow us to compute $Pr(X_{i,j} = 1)$ in terms of $|S_{i,j}|$. It remains to impose an upper bound on $|S_{i,j}|$.

Lemma 16. *For each pseudoedge $\{t_i, t_j\}$ of H, $|S_{i,j}| \leq 4 * \log m/4.9 + 5$.*

Proof. For the purpose of this lemma, the height of a rooted tree T is the largest number of vertices in a root-leaf path of T. We denote by $\ell(T)$ the number of leaves of T.

Claim 1. *The height of a full balanced binary tree T is at most $\log(\ell(T)) + 2$.*

Proof. By definition of pseudoexpander, $|P^{1/2}_{i \to j}| \leq \log m/4.9 + 3$. The variables of $S_{i,j}$ consist of internal variables of $P^{1/2}_{i \to j}$, the internal variables of $P^{1/2}_{j \to i}$, the siblings of these two, and $\ell_{i,j}$. The number of internal vertices of $P^{1/2}_{i \to j}$ is at most $\log m/4.9 + 1$. Clearly, the same upper bound holds for the number of internal vertices of $P^{1/2}_{j \to i}$, for the number of siblings of the internal vertices of $P^{1/2}_{i \to j}$, and the number of siblings of the internal vertices of $P^{1/2}_{j \to i}$. Therefore, the total size of $S_{i,j}$ is at most $4 * (\log m/4.9 + 1) + 1 = 4 * \log m/4.9 + 5$. ■

Proof of the first statement of Theorem 8. The lower bound on $Pr(X_{i,j} = 1)$ is obtained by the following line of reasoning.

$$Pr(X_{i,j} = 1) = \sum_{S \in \mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) = \sum_{S \in \mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}} (1/2)^{|S|} =$$
$$3 * (1/2)^{|S_{i,j}|+2} \geq 3 * (1/2)^{4 * \log m/4.9 + 7} = 3/128 * m^{-4/4.9} \quad (20)$$

where the first equality follows from the second statement of Lemma 15, the second equality follows from the combination of the first statement of Lemma 15 and Lemma 14, the third equality follows from definition of $\mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}$, the first inequality follows from Lemma 16. ■

In order to establish the second statement of Theorem 8, we represent $Pr(X_{i,j} = 0)$ as the sum of probabilities of $\mathbf{EC}$-events of guarded sets of literals. For this purpose, we define the set $\mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}$ consisting of all the set of literals over the variables of $S_{i,j}$ plus $\{t_i, t_j\}$ such that each $S \in \mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}$ does not falsify any clause and satisfies one of the following two conditions.

1. At least one non-root variable of $C_{i,j}$ is assigned positively.
2. At least one sibling of an internal variable of $C_{i,j}$ is assigned negatively.

Lemma 17. *1. Each $S \in \mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}$ is guarded.*

2. $Pr(X_{i,j} = 0) = Pr(\bigcup_{S \in \mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}} \mathbf{EC}(S))$.

Proof. $S \in \mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}$ assigns all the variables of $C_{i,j}$ and does not falsify $C_{i,j}$. This means that either one of non-leaf variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur positively in S (and in this case the second condition of Definition 20 is satisfied) or, otherwise, the $\ell_{i,j}$ occur positively in $C_{i,j}$ and the rest of variables occur negatively, thus satisfying the third condition of Definition 20. Consequently, S is guarded from $C_{i,j}$. Except $\ell_{i,j}$, no other leaf variable occurs in S, therefore S is guarded from the rest of clauses of ϕ_H according to the first condition of Definition 20, confirming the first statement.

For the second statement, it is enough to show that $\{S' | S' \in \mathbf{SAT}(H) \wedge X_{i,j}(S') = 0\} = \bigcup_{S \in \mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}} \mathbf{EC}(S)$.

Let $S' \in \mathbf{SAT}(H)$ such that $X_{i,j}(S') = 0$. By Observation 1, $S_{i,j} \not\subseteq S'$. Then the projection S'' of S' to the variables of $S_{i,j}$ plus $\{t_i, t_j\}$ does not contain $S_{i,j}$ either. Clearly, S'' satisfies one of the two conditions for $\mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}$ and, as S'' does not falsify any clause, $S'' \in \mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}$. As $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S'')$, we conclude that $S' \in \bigcup_{S \in \mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}} \mathbf{EC}(S)$.

Conversely, let $S' \in \bigcup_{S \in \mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}} \mathbf{EC}(S)$. Then there is $S'' \in \mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}$ such that $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S'')$. By the definition of $\mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}$, all the variables of $S_{i,j}$ occur in S'' and at least one of them occurs oppositely to its occurrence in $S_{i,j}$. Clearly, the same is preserved in S'. Hence, $S_{i,j} \not\subseteq S'$ and therefore $X_{i,j}(S') = 0$. ■

We also need one more statement on guarded sets which will be proved in Subsection 6.3

Lemma 18. *Let $\mathbf{S_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{S_q}$ be guarded sets of literals over sets $V_1, \ldots, V_q$ of variables such that $V_i \cap V_j = \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq q$. Then $Pr(\bigcap_{i=1}^{q} \bigcup_{S \in \mathbf{S}_i} \mathbf{EC}(S)) = \prod_{i=1}^{q} Pr(\bigcup_{S \in \mathbf{S}_i} \mathbf{EC}(S))$*

Proof of the second statement of Theorem 8. We need to show that for any $M' \subseteq M$ and for any set of numbers $a_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ for each $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M'$, $Pr(\bigcap_{\{t_i,t_j\} \in M'} (X_{i,j} = a_{i,j})) = \prod_{\{t_i,t_j\} \in M'} Pr(X_{i,j} = a_{i,j})$. Partition M' into

M'_1 and M'_2 such that $a_{i,j} = 1$ for all $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M'_1$ and $a_{i,j} = 0$ for all $\{t_i, t_j\} \in M'_2$. Then

$$Pr(\bigcap_{\{t_i,t_j\}\in M'}(X_{i,j} = a_{i,j})) = Pr(\bigcap_{\{t_i,t_j\}\in M'_1}(X_{i,j} = 1) \cap \bigcap_{\{t_i,t_j\}\in M'_2}(X_{i,j} = 0)) =$$
$$Pr(\bigcap_{\{t_i,t_j\}\in M'_1}\bigcup_{S\in\mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}}\mathbf{EC}(S) \cap \bigcap_{\{t_i,t_j\}\in M'_1}\bigcup_{S\in\mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}}\mathbf{EC}(S)) =$$
$$\prod_{\{t_i,t_j\}\in M'_1} Pr(\bigcup_{S\in\mathbf{POSX}_{i,j}}\mathbf{EC}(S)) * \prod_{\{t_i,t_j\}\in M'_2} Pr(\bigcup_{S\in\mathbf{NEGX}_{i,j}}\mathbf{EC}(S)) =$$
$$\prod_{\{t_i,t_j\}\in M'_1} Pr(X_{i,j} = 1) * \prod_{\{t_i,t_j\}\in M'_2} Pr(X_{i,j} = 0) = \prod_{\{t_i,t_j\}\in M'} Pr(X_{i,j} = a_{i,j}) \quad (21)$$

where the second and the fourth equalities follow from the combination Lemma 15 and Lemma 17, the third equality follows from Lemma 18 together with Lemma 15 and Lemma 17. ■

6.3 Proof of Lemmas for guarded sets

Lemma 19. *Let S be a guarded set of literals. Then the following statements hold.*

1. *Let x be a literal of a non-leaf variable that does not occur in S. Then $S \cup \{x\}$ is a guarded set if literals with $Fix(S \cup \{x\}) = Fix(S)$.*
2. *Let x be a literal of $\ell_{i,j}$ such that $\ell_{i,j}$ does not occur in S and at least one variable of $C_{i,j}$ occurs positively in S.*

   Then $S \cup \{x\}$ is a guarded set if literals with $Fix(S \cup \{x\}) = Fix(S)$.
3. *Assume that $\ell_{i,j}$ does not occur in S and the rest of variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur negatively in S. Then $S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\}$ is a guarded set if literals with $Fix(S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\}) = Fix(S) \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x \notin S$ is a literal of a variable y such that $S \cup \{x\}$ is not guarded while S is guarded. Hence, there is a clause $C_{i,j}$ such that S is guarded from $C_{i,j}$ while $S \cup \{x\}$ is not guarded from $C_{i,j}$. Clearly, this means that y occurs in $C_{i,j}$, and hence not all variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur in S Consequently, S does not satisfy the third condition of Definition 20 regarding $C_{i,j}$ because this condition clearly requires that all the variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur in S. Also, note that if S satisfies the second condition of Definition 20 regarding $C_{i,j}$, this condition cannot be violated by introduction of a new literal. Consequently, S can satisfy the first condition only, that is some non-leaf variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur in S and all their occurrences are *negative*. The first condition clearly cannot be violated if y is a non-leaf variable. Thus $y = \ell_{i,j}$.

The reasoning in the previous paragraph immediately implies that $S \cup \{x\}$, as in the first statement, is guarded because x is a literal of an internal variable and that $S \cup \{x\}$, as in the second statement, is guarded because the second condition is satisfied regarding $C_{i,j}$. For the third statement, note since *all* the non-leaf variables of $C_{i,j}$

occur negatively in S, $S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\}$ satisfies the third condition of Definition 20 regarding $C_{i,j}$. Therefore, $S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\}$ remains guarded.

Now, let us prove the equations concerning the fixed sets. Observe that in all the considered cases $Fix(S) \subseteq Fix(S \cup \{x\})$. Indeed, suppose $\ell_{i,j} \in Fix(S)$. This means that $\ell_{i,j} \in S$ and the rest of variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur negatively in S. Clearly, these occurrences are preserved in any superset of S.

Now, suppose that $\ell_{i,j} \in Fix(S \cup \{x\}) \setminus Fix(S)$, and hence $x = \ell_{i,j}$.

Then $\ell_{i,j} \in (S \cup \{x\}) \setminus S$. Indeed, if $\ell_{i,j} \in S$ then to keep S guarded from $C_{i,j}$, the second condition of Definition 20 must be satisfied (the third condition cannot be satisfied because of the assumption that $\ell_{i,j} \notin Fix(S)$). But then one of non-leaf variables of $C_{i,j}$ occurs in S (and hence also in $S \cup \{x\}$) positively blocking the possibility of $\ell_{i,j}$ being fixed. Moreover, all the internal variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur in S negatively. This immediately implies that $Fix(S \cup \{x\}) \subseteq Fix(S)$ in the first case (because x is not a leaf variable) and in the second case (because S contains a positive occurrence of a non-leaf variable of $C_{i,j}$).

For the third case, the above reasoning implies that $Fix(S \cup \{x\}) \subseteq Fix(S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\})$ and since by definition, $\ell_{i,j} \in Fix(S \cup \{x\})$, the opposite containment follows as well. ■

Proof of Lemma 14. The proof is by induction on the number of variables that *do not* occur in S. Assume first that all the variables are assigned. Note that S does not falsify any clause. Indeed, if clause $C_{i,j}$ is falsified then none of the conditions of Definition 20 can be met. By definition of the probability space, $Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) = 2^{-|V(H) \setminus Fix(S)|} = 2^{-|S \setminus Fix(S)|}$.

Assume now that S does not assign all the variables. Suppose first that some non-leaf variable y does not occur in S.

As in any $S' \in \mathbf{EC}(S)$ y occurs either positively or negatively, $\mathbf{EC}(S) = \mathbf{EC}(S \cup \{y\}) \cup \mathbf{EC}(S \cup \{\neg y\})$. In fact, by Lemma 8, the union is disjoint. Also, note that for each $x \in \{y, \neg y\}$, the following is true.

$$|S \cup \{x\} \setminus Fix(S \cup \{x\})| = |S \cup \{x\}| - |Fix(S \cup \{x\})| = \\ |S + 1| - |Fix(S)| = |S \setminus Fix(S)| + 1 \quad (22)$$

where the first equality is correct because $Fix(S \cup \{x\}) \subseteq S \cup \{x\}$, $|S \cup \{x\}| = |S| + 1$ since x does not occur in S, $Fix(S \cup \{x\}) = Fix(S)$ according to the first statement of Lemma 19, and the last equality is correct because $Fix(S) \subseteq S$.

Therefore,

$$Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) = Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S \cup \{y\})) + Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S \cup \{\neg y\})) = \\ 2^{-|(S \cup \{y\}) \setminus Fix(S \cup \{y\}|} + 2^{-|(S \cup \{\neg y\}) \setminus Fix(S \cup \{\neg y\}|} = 2^{-(|S \setminus Fix(S)| + 1)} + 2^{-(|S \setminus Fix(S)| + 1)} = \\ 2^{-|S \setminus Fix(S)|} \quad (23)$$

where the second equality follows because, according to the first statement of Lemma 19, both $S \cup \{y\}$ and $S \cup \{\neg y\}$ are guarded and they assigned more variables than S, therefore the statement of this lemma holds for them according to the induction assumption. The third equality follows from (22).

Suppose now that S assigns all the non-leaf variables and let $\ell_{i,j}$ be a variable not assigned by S. If at least one of variables of $C_{i,j}$ occurs positively in S, then the reasoning is analogous to the above with the second statement of Lemma 19 used instead of the first one.

Otherwise, all the non-leaf variables of $C_{i,j}$ occur in S negatively. In this case $\ell_{i,j}$ occurs positively in any element of $\mathbf{EC}(S)$ (for otherwise $C_{i,j}$ is falsified). That is, $\mathbf{EC}(S) = \mathbf{EC}(S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\})$. Therefore

$$Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) = Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\})) = (1/2)^{|(S\cup\{\ell_{i,j}\})\setminus Fix(S\cup\{\ell_{i,j}\})|} = (1/2)^{|(S\cup\{\ell_{i,j}\})|-|Fix(S\cup\{\ell_{i,j}\})|} = (1/2)^{|S|+1-(|Fix(S)|+1)} = (1/2)^{|S|-|Fix(S)|} = (1/2)^{|S\setminus Fix(S)|} \quad (24)$$

where the second equality follows from the third statement of Lemma 19 and the induction assumption, the third equality follows because $Fix(S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\}) \subseteq S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\}$. For the fourth equality, note that $|(S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\})| = |S| + 1$ as $\ell_{i,j} \notin S$ and that by the third statement of Lemma 19, $Fix(S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\}) = Fix(S) \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\}$ and hence $|Fix(S \cup \{\ell_{i,j}\})| = |Fix(S)| + 1$. The last equality follows because $Fix(S) \subseteq S$. ■

Lemma 20. *Let $S_1, \ldots, S_q$ be guarded sets of literals over pairwise disjoint sets of variables. Then $Pr(\mathbf{EC}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{q} S_i)) = \prod_{i=1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_i))$.*

Proof. Let us show that $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} S_i$ is guarded. Indeed, consider a clause $C_{j,k}$. If $\ell_{j,k}$ does not occur in S, then S satisfies the first condition of Definition 20. Otherwise, there is S_i such that $\ell_{j,k}$ occurs in S_i. As S_i is guarded from $C_{j,k}$ either the second or the third condition is satisfied for S_i regarding $C_{j,k}$. It is not hard to see that both these conditions are preserved in every superset of S_i.

By Lemma 14 and also taking into account that $Fix(S) \subseteq S$ and that $S_1, \ldots, S_q$ are mutually disjoint, we obtain the following.

$$Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) = (1/2)^{|S\setminus Fix(S)|} = (1/2)^{|S|-|Fix(S)|} = (1/2)^{(\sum_{i=1}^{q}|S_i|)-|Fix(S)|} \quad (25)$$

We next show that $Fix(S) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} Fix(S_i)$. As each fixed element of F_i remains fixed in a superset of F_i, $\bigcup_{i=1}^{q} Fix(S_i) \subseteq Fix(S)$.

Conversely, suppose that there is $\ell_{j,k} \in Fix(S)\setminus\bigcup_{i=1}^{q} Fix(S_i)$. As $\ell_{j,k} \in S$, there is i such that $\ell_{j,k} \in S_i$. Since $\ell_{j,k} \notin Fix(S_i)$, S_i does not satisfy the third condition of Definition 20 regarding $C_{j,k}$. To remain guarded from $C_{j,k}$, S_i must satisfy the second condition of Definition 20 regarding $C_{j,k}$. That is, a non-leaf variable of $C_{j,k}$ occurs positively in S_i and hence also in S, in contradiction to $\ell_{j,k} \in Fix(S)$, thus confirming that $Fix(S) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} Fix(S_i)$.

Due to the pairwise disjointness of $S_1, \ldots, S_q$, $Fix(S_1), \ldots, Fix(S_q)$ are pairwise disjoint (as being subsets of $S_1, \ldots, S_q$ respectively.) Therefore, $|Fix(S)| = \sum_{i=1}^{q} |Fix(S_i)|$. Substituting this equality into the right-most item of (25), we obtain

$$Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S)) = (1/2)^{(\sum_{i=1}^{q}|S_i|)-\sum_{i=1}^{q}|Fix(S_i)|} = (1/2)^{\sum_{i=1}^{q}(|S_i|-|Fix(S_i)|)} =$$
$$(1/2)^{\sum_{i=1}^{q}|S_i\setminus Fix(S_i)|} = \prod_{i=1}^{q}(1/2)^{|S_i\setminus Fix(S_i)|} = \prod_{i=1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_i)) \quad (26)$$

where the second equality follows because $Fix(S_i) \subseteq S_i$ and the last equality follows from Lemma 14. ■

Proof of Lemma 18. The lemma is proved through the following line of reasoning.

$$Pr(\bigcap_{i=1}^{q}\bigcup_{S_i\in\mathbf{S}_i}\mathbf{EC}(S_i)) = Pr(\bigcup_{(S_1,\ldots,S_q)\in\mathbf{S}_1\times\cdots\times\mathbf{S}_q}\bigcap_{i=1}^{q}\mathbf{EC}(S_i)) =$$
$$Pr(\bigcup_{(S_1,\ldots,S_q)\in\mathbf{S}_1\times\cdots\times\mathbf{S}_q}\mathbf{EC}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{q}S_i)) = \sum_{(S_1,\ldots,S_q)\in\mathbf{S}_1\times\cdots\times\mathbf{S}_q} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{q}S_i)) =$$
$$\sum_{(S_1,\ldots,S_q)\in\mathbf{S}_1\times\cdots\times\mathbf{S}_q}\prod_{i=1}^{q} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_i)) = \prod_{i=1}^{q}\sum_{S_i\in\mathbf{S}_i} Pr(\mathbf{EC}(S_i)) =$$
$$\prod_{i=1}^{q} Pr(\bigcup_{S_i\in\mathbf{S}_i}\mathbf{EC}(S_i)) \quad (27)$$

For the second equality, we demonstrate that for any set $S_1, \ldots, S_q$ of literals, $\mathbf{EC}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{q} S_i) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{q}\mathbf{EC}(S_i)$. If $S \in \mathbf{EC}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{q} S_i)$ then $S_i \subseteq S$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$, thus $S \in \mathbf{EC}(S_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$. Conversely, if $S \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{q}\mathbf{EC}(S_i)$, then $S_i \subseteq S$ for all $1 \leq i \leq q$. That is $\bigcup_{i=1}^{q} S_i \subseteq S$ and hence $S \in \mathbf{EC}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{q} S_i)$. Note that since the elements of *both* sets are subsets of $\mathbf{SAT}(H)$, there is no need to explicitly mention that the S being considered is a satisfying assignment of ϕ_H.

The third equality follows from Lemma 8 because for two distinct tuples $(S_1, \ldots, S_q)$, $\bigcup_{i=1}^{q} S_i$ are distinct sets of literals over the same set of variables. The fourth equality follows from Lemma 20. The last equality follows from Lemma 8 applied individually to each $\mathbf{S}_i$. ■

References

[1] Noga Alon and Wolfgang Maass. Meanders and their applications in lower bounds arguments. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 37(2):118–129, 1988.

[2] László Babai, Noam Nisan, and Mario Szegedy. Multiparty protocols, pseudo-random generators for logspace, and time-space trade-offs. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 45(2):204–232, 1992.

[3] Allan Borodin, Alexander A. Razborov, and Roman Smolensky. On lower bounds for read-k-times branching programs. *Computational Complexity*, 3:1–18, 1993.

[4] Anna Gál. A simple function that requires exponential size read-once branching programs. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 62(1):13–16, 1997.

[5] Stasys Jukna. A note on read-k times branching programs. *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC)*, 1(27), 1994.

[6] Stasys Jukna. A nondeterministic space-time tradeoff for linear codes. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 109(5):286–289, 2009.

[7] Stasys Jukna. *Boolean Function Complexity: Advances and Frontiers*. Springer-Verlag, 2012.

[8] Stasys Jukna and Georg Schnitger. Triangle-freeness is hard to detect. *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing*, 11(6):549–569, 2002.

[9] Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal. *Probability and computing - randomized algorithms and probabilistic analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

[10] Igor Razgon. On the read-once property of branching programs and cnfs of bounded treewidth. *Algorithmica*, To appear, 2015.

[11] Ingo Wegener. *Branching Programs and Binary Decision Diagrams*. SIAM Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and applications, 2000.

A Simulation of a d-NBP by a uniform d-NBP

Let Z be a d-NBP and let $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ be its vertices listed in the topological order. For a variable x of $F(Z)$ and a node v of Z, denote by $n_Z(v, x)$ the largest number of occurrences of variable x on a path of Z from the source to v. We introduce a sequence of NBPs $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$ defined as follows. $Z_1 = Z$.

For $i > 1$, $Z_i = Z_{i-1}$ if v has only one in-coming edge. Otherwise, Z_{i-1} is transformed into Z_i by the following process. First, whenever there is an edge (u, v) of Z_{i-1} that is labelled subdivide this edge by introducing a new vertex w and replacing (u, v) with edges (u, w) and (w, v) with (u, w) being labelled by the label of (u, v) and (w, v) being unlabelled. This way we obtain an NBP Z'_i where v has the same number of in-coming edges as in Z_{i-1} however all in-coming edges of v are unlabelled.

The second stage of transformation ensures that for each incoming edge (u, v) of Z'_i and for each variable x, the largest number of occurrences of x on a path from the sink to v that goes through (u, v) is $n_{Z_{i-1}}(v, x)$. To this end, for each edge (u, v) of Z'_i, let $x_1, \ldots, x_q$ be the set of variables such that for each $1 \leq i \leq q$, $n_{Z'_i}(u, x_i) < n_{Z_{i-1}}(v, x_i)$. Let $m_1, \ldots, m_q$ be such that $m_i = n_{Z_{i-1}}(v, x_i) - n_{Z'_i}(u, x_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$. Introduce new vertices $v_{1,1}, \ldots, v_{1,m_1}, \ldots v_{q,1}, \ldots, v_{q,m_q}$. Replace the edge (u, v) by the following edges.

- Two edges from u to $v_{1,1}$ one labelled with x_1, the other labelled with $\neg x_1$.
- For $1 < j \leq m_1$, two edges from $v_{1,j-1}$ to $v_{1,j}$, one labelled with x_1, the other labelled with $\neg x_1$.

- For each $1 < i \leq q$, two edges from $v_{i-1,m_{i-1}}$ to $v_{i,1}$ one labelled with x_i, the other labelled with $\neg x_i$.
- For each $1 < i \leq q$ ad each $1 < j \leq m_i$, two edges from $v_{i,j-1}$ to $v_{i,j}$ one labelled with x_i, the other labelled with $\neg x_i$.
- Two edges from v_{q,m_q} to v one labelled with x_q, the other labelled with $\neg x_q$.

Arguing by induction on $v_1, \ldots, v_n$, the following statements can be made.

1. Each Z_i is a d-NBP.
2. For each Z_i and each variable x, all the paths from the source to v_i have the same number of occurrences of x which is $n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i, x)$.
3. All the Z_i compute the same function.

For $i = 1$, all three statements follow from definition of Z so we assume $i > 1$.

Next, we are going to show that for each in-neighbour u of v in Z'_i and for each variable x, the number of occurrences of x on each path of Z'_i from the soruce to u is exactly $n_{Z'_i}(u, x_i)$.

Indeed, assume first that u is a vertex of Z_{i-1} (that is, it has not been introduced in Z'_i as a result of subdivision). Then $u = v_j$ for some $j < i$. Indeed, otherwise, u is a new vertex that has been introduced during construction of some Z_j for $j < i$. Then only vertex of Z_j such a new vertex can be an in-neighbour at the stage of its introducing is v_j. Moreover, such a vertex cannot have an out-going edge to v_i introduced at a latter stage because one end of such edge must be a new vertex introduced at a latter stage (which is not u that has been introduced during construction of Z_j and not v_i that exists in Z_1). Thus, in this case, the desired statement is correct by the induction assumption. The last statement requires further explanation. The induction assumption, as such, states that the number of occurrences of x on each path of Z_j from the source to v_j is $n_{Z_j}(v_j, x)$. In particular, the induction assumption says nothing about the paths from the surce to v_j in $Z_{i'}$ for $i' > j$. However, the paths from the source to v_j are not affected by the subsequence transformations of Z_j into Z_{j+1} and so on, hence the induction assumption remains invariant and, moreover, $n_{Z_j}(v_j, x) = n_{Z_{i'}}(v_j, x)$ for all $i' > j$. As paths from the source to u are not affected by a transformation from Z_{i-1} to Z'_i, $n_{Z_j}(v_j, x) = n_{Z'_i}(v_j, x)$ as required.

Otherwise, if u is not a vertex of Z_{i-1}, there is an in-neighbour u' of v_i such that u is introduced as a result of subdivision of an edge e from u' to v_i. By the previous paragraph $u' = v_j$ for some $j < i$. Then, by the induction assumption, the number of occurrences of x on any path of Z'_i from the source to u' is $n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_j, x)$ (the reasoning is as in the previous paragraph). Any path of Z'_i from the source to u is a path from the source to u' plus the edge (u', u). If the variable labelling (u', u) is not x then the number of occurrences on any such path is $n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_j, x)$, otherwise it is $n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_j, x) + 1$. In both cases, the number of occurrences on any path of Z'_i from the source to u is invariant and hence equals $n_{Z'_i}(u, x)$.

Note that $n_{Z'_i}(u, x) \leq n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i, x)$ because it is just the largest number of occurrences of x on a path of Z_{i-1} from the source to v_i going through a particular edge

((u,v) or (u',v) depending on whether this edge is subdividied by transformation from Z_{i-1} to Z'_i). If $n_{Z'_i}(u,x) = n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i)$ then x does not occur on a path between u and v_i in Z_i. Therefore the number of occurrences of x on a path of Z_i from the soruce to v_i is as in Z'_i which is $n_{Z'_i}(u,x) = n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i,x)$. Otherwise, there is $1 \leq j \leq q$ such that $x = x_j$ and on each path of Z_i from u to v there are $m_j = n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i,x) - n_{Z'_i}(u,x)$ occurrences of x. That is the total number of occurrences on each path of Z_i from the source to v_i passing through u is $n_{Z'_i}(u,x) + m_j = n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i,x)$. Since u is selected as an arbitrary in-neighbour of v_i in Z'_i, there are $n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i,x)$ occurrences of x on any path from the source to v_i. This confirms the second statement.

For the first statement, it is sufficient to verify that on any source-sink path of Z_i going through v_i each variable x occurs at most d times. Indeed, on each v_i-sink path Q of Z_{i-1} each variable x occurs at most $d - n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i,x)$ times. Otherwise, take a path P of Z_{i-1} from the source to v_i on which there are $n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i,x)$ occurrences of Z_i (such a path exists by definition of $n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i,x)$) and let Q be a path of Z_{i-1} from v_i to the sink having more that $d - n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i,x)$ occurrences of x. Then $P+Q$ is source-sink path of Z_{i-1} with more than d occurrences of x in contradiction to the first statement holding regarding Z_{i-1} by the induction assumption. Since the paths from v_i to sink are not affected by transformation from Z_{i-1} to Z_i, wee conclude that on each v_i-sink path Q of Z_i, each variable x occurs at most $d - n_{Z_{i-1}}(v_i,x)$ times. Together with the second statement, this implies that on each source sink path of Z_i going through v_i each variable occurs at most d times thus confirming the first statement.

Let us verify the third statement, in particular, let us show that Z_{i-1} and Z_i compute he same function. Let S be a satisfying assignment of $F(Z_{i-1})$. This means that Z_{i-1} has a computational path P with $A(P) \subseteq S$. If P does not contain v_i then P is a computational path of Z_i and hence S is a satisfying assignment of Z_i. Otherwise, let u be the vertex preceding v_i in P. If u is an in-neighbour of v_i in Z_i then, again, P is a computational path of Z_i. Otherwise, let P_1 be the prefix of P ending at u and let P_2 be the suffix of P beginning at v_i. By contruction, both P_1 and P_2 are paths of Z_i. Then choose a path P_0 between u and v in Z_i so that each variable labelling the path has the same occurrence as in S (this possible to do due to the 'paraller edges' construction as described above). Then $P_1 + P_0 + P_2$ is a path of Z_i such that $A(P_1 + P_0 + P_2) \subseteq S$.

Conversely, let S be a satisfying assignment of Z_i and let P be a computational path of Z_i with $A(P) \subseteq S$. It is sufficient to consider the case where P is not a computational path of Z_{i-1}. Then P contains new vertices of Z_i and hence contains v_i (because any path from a new vertex to the sink goes through v_i). Moreover, the immediate predecessor of v_i in P is a new vertex of Z_i. Let u be the last in-neighbour of v_i in Z_{i-1} preceding v_i in P. Let P' be obtained from P by replacing the $u \longrightarrow v_i$ subpath of P with the (u,v_i) edge of Z_{i-1} carrying the same label as in Z_{i-1}. Then P' is a computational path By construction $A(P') \subseteq A(P)$ (in particular, the process of transformation of edge (u,v_i) into a path retains the label of (u,v_i) on any resulting $u \longrightarrow v_i$ path and hence $A(P') \subseteq S$

It follows that Z_n computes the same function as Z and each variable x occurs the same number of times $n_x \leq k$ on each computational path of Z_n. For those variables x where $n_x < k$ add $k - n_x$ entries on each in-coming edge of the sink using the same subdivision technique as was used for transformation from Z_{i-1} to Z_i. Then, by the analogous reasoning it can be verified that the resulting NBP Z^* becomes uniform

k-NBP computing the same function as Z.

Let us calculate the size of Z^* in terms of the size of Z. Note that for the purpose of this proof $|Z|$ is denoted by n. The number of variables cannot be more than the number of edges of Z therefore is bounded by $O(n^2)$. On each of the n iterations, at most n edges are transformed (an in-degree of a node cannot be larger than n) and on each node the number of copies added is bounded by the number of variables multiplied by k that is $O(n^2) * k$. Therefore, the size of Z^* is $O(n^4 * k)$. (Note that the size increase of the final transformation from Z_n to Z^* is dominated by this complexity and so can be safely ignored).

B Proof of Theorem 5

B.1 Constructively created CNFs

We will next define a set of graphs G_m. Then we will define a set of CNFs $\varphi(G_m)$ associated with graphs G_m. The CNFs $\varphi(G_m)$ is the class for which we will prove the lower bound stated in the theorem.

Let $T_1^*, \ldots, T_m^*$ be a set binary rooted trees with $\lfloor m^{1/4.9} \rfloor$ leaves each and height at most $\log m/4.9 + 2$. Such trees can be created as follows. Let $a \geq m^{1/4.9}$ be the nearest to $m^{1/4.9}$ integer which is a power of two. Take a complete binary tree T' with a leaves. Then choose an arbitrary set L of $\lfloor m^{1/4.9} \rfloor$ leaves and let each T_i^* be obtained from T' by taking the union of all root-leaf trees ending at L. The height of T' is $\log a + 1$ and, as $a \leq 2 * m^{1/4.9}$, the height does not exceed $\log m/4.9 + 2$.

Then for each $1 \leq i \neq j \leq m$ and each pair of leaves ℓ_1 of T_i and ℓ_2 of T_j, introduce a new vertex v and connect it by edges to ℓ_1 and ℓ_2. We call these new vertices v *subdivision vertices*. The graph G_m consists of the union of $T_1^*, \ldots T_m^*$ plus the subdivision vertices together with the edges incident to them.

The variables of $\varphi(G_m)$ are the vertices of G_m. The clauses correspond to the subdivision vertices. Let v be a subdivision vertex. Then the clause C_v corresponding to it is created as follows. Let ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 be two leaves of trees T_i^* and T_j^* incident to v. Let P_1 and P_2 be respective root-leaf paths of T_i^* and T_j^* ending with ℓ_1 and ℓ_2. The literals of C_v are $V(P_1) \cup \{v\} \cup V(P_2)$.

It is not hard to see that $\varphi(G_m)$ can be created by a deterministic procedure taking polynomial time in the number of variables.

In the next subsection we formally prove that for a sufficiently large m, it is possible to assign a subset of subdivision vertices with $true$ so that the remaining CNF is ϕ_H where H is a pseudoexpander with m roots. Then, in Section B.3. we will show that the lower bound for ϕ_H implies that lower bound for $\varphi(G_m)$.

B.2 Extraction of CNFs based on pseudoexpanders

Let F be a Boolean function and let S be a partial assignment to a subset of its variables. Then $F|_S$ is a function on variables not assigned by S and S' is a satisfying assignment of $F|_S$ if and only if $S \cup S'$ is a satisfying assignment of F.

If φ is a monotone CNF and S consists of positive literals of a subset of variables of φ then $\varphi|_S$ is obtained by removal of clauses where the variables of S occur. In this section we are going to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 21. *Let m be an integer and suppose that there exist a pseudoexpander H with m roots and max pseudodegree $m^{1/4.9}$. Then there is a set S of positive literals of subdivision vertices of $\varphi(G_m)$ such that $\varphi(G_m)|_S$ is $\phi_{H'}$ where H' is a subgraph of G_m which is a pseudoexpander with m roots and with $U(H)$ isomorphic to $U(H')$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{Roots}(H) = \{t_1, \ldots, t_m\}$ and let $t'_1, \ldots, t'_m$ be the respective roots of the trees $T_1^*, \ldots T_m^*$ of G_m (let us call them the *roots* of G_m). Recall that by $U(H)$ we denote the underlying graph of H. For $1 \leq i \leq m$, denote by I_i the set of j such that t_i is adjacent to t_j in $U(H)$. Note that since the max-degree of $U(H)$ is at most $m^{1/4.9}$, the number of leaves of T_i^* is at least $|I_i|$. For each i, fix an arbitrary subset of $|I_i|$ leaves of T_i^* and mark them with with the indices of I_i, each index marking one leaf.

Now consider a subdivision vertex v of G_m connecting a leaf ℓ_1 of T_i and a leaf ℓ_2 of T_j. Let us call v *meaningful* if ℓ_1 is marked with j and T_j is marked with i. Let S be the set consisting of all non-meaningful subdivision vertices and let $\varphi' = \varphi(G_m)|_S$.

For $1 \leq i \leq m$, let T'_i be the rooted tree obtained from T_i^* by taking the union of all root-leaf paths of T_i^* that end with marked leaves. We prove the following statements about trees T'_i.

1. Each leaf of each T'_i is incident to exactly one meaningful vertex.
2. For each edge $\{t_i, t_j\}$ of $U(H)$, there is exactly one meaningful vertex adjacent to both T'_i and T'_j.
3. If t_i and t_j are not adjacent in U_H then there is no meaningful vertex adjacent to both T'_i and T'_j.

Indeed, let ℓ_1 be a leaf of T'_i. By definition of I_i, ℓ_1 is marked with a j such that $\{t_i, t_j\}$ is an edge of $U(H)$. Consequently, by definition of I_j, T'_i has a leaf ℓ_2 marked with i. By definition of G_m, there exists a subdivision vertex v incident to both ℓ_1 and ℓ_2. By definition of meaningful vertices, v is meaningful. Assume that ℓ_1 is incident to another meaningful vertex $u \neq v$. Then, by definition of G_m, u connects ℓ_1 to a leaf $\ell_3 \neq \ell_2$ of T_j. By definition of a meaningful vertex, ℓ_3 is marked with i in contradiction to the procedure of marking of T_j^* that does not assign two different leaves with the same element of I_j. Thus we have proved the first statement.

Let $\{t_i, t_j\}$ be an edge of $U(H)$. Then, by definition of I_i and I_j, T'_i has a leaf ℓ_1 marked with j and T'_j has a leaf ℓ_2 marked with i. The subdivision vertex v connecting ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 is a meaningful vertex adjacent to T'_i and T'_j. Suppose there is another meaningful vertex u adjacent to both T'_i and T'_j. Then u is a subdivision vertex of G_m adjacent to a leaf ℓ_3 of T'_i and a leaf ℓ_4 of T'_j. Since $u \neq v$, by construction of G_m, either $\ell_3 \neq \ell_1$ or $\ell_4 \neq \ell_2$. Assume the former w.l.o.g. Then ℓ_3 cannot be marked with j and hence u is not meaningful, a contradiction. Thus we have proved the second statement.

For the third statement, assume by contradiction that there are T'_i and T'_j such that, on the one hand $\{t_i, t_j\}$ is not an edge of $U(H)$ and, on the other hand, there is a meaningful vertex v adjacent to both T'_i and T'_j. Let ℓ_1 be the leaf of T'_i adjacent to v. Then ℓ_1 is marked with j implying that $j \in I_i$, a contradiction proving the third statement.

For $1 \leq i \leq m$, let T''_i be the rooted tree having the same root t'_i as T'_i and obtained from T'_i by adding to each leaf ℓ of T'_i the edge $\{\ell, v\}$ where v is the meaningful vertex adjacent to ℓ according to the first statement above. Let H' be the union of $T'_1, \ldots, T'_m$. We are going to prove that $H' \in \mathbf{BTB}$ with $\mathbf{T}(H') = \{T''_1, \ldots, T''_m\}$ with $U(H')$ isomorphic to $U(H)$.

That $T''_1, \ldots, T''_m$ are all extended follows by construction. Let v be a leaf of T''_i and let us show that v is a leaf of exactly one other tree T''_j. Let ℓ_1 be the only neighbour of v in T''_i. By definition, ℓ_1 is a leaf of T'_i. Let j be the mark of ℓ_1. By definition of v as a meaningful vertex, it is connected to a leaf ℓ_2 of T_j marked with i. We claim that v is a leaf of T_j. Indeed, let u be the leaf of T''_j adjacent to ℓ_2 (such a leaf exists by construction). Then u is a meaningful vertex adjacent to ℓ_2. By the first statement above, there is only one meaningful vertex adjacent to ℓ_2 and hence $u = v$. Note that T''_i and T''_j can only have joint leaves as T'_i and T'_j are vertex disjoint. Moreover, by construction, a joint leaf of T''_i and T''_j is a meaningful vertex adjacent to both T'_i and T'_j. By the third statement, there can be at most one such a meaningful vertex, confirming that $H' \in \mathbf{BTB}$. The third statement in fact claims that such a vertex exists if and only $\{t_i, t_j\}$ is an edge of $U(H)$. That is T''_i and T''_j have a joint leaf if and only if $\{t_i, t_j\}$ is an edge of $U(H)$ establishing a natural isomorphism between $U(H')$ and $U(H)$ with t'_i corresponding to t_i.

Note that that the height of each T'_i does not exceed the height of T^*_i and hence is at most $\log m/4.9 + 2$. Hence, the height of each T''_i is at most $\log m/4.9 + 3$. Consequently, H' is a pseudoexpander.

It remains to show that $\varphi(G_m)|_S = phi(H')$. By definition, the clauses of $\phi(H')$ correspond to the edges $U(H')$. Consider the clause $C_{i,j}$ corresponding to an edge $\{t'_i, t'_j\}$ of H'. Let v be the joint leaf of T''_i and T''_j. By definition, $C_{i,j}$ contains the vertices of the root-leaf path of T''_i ending with v and the vertices of the root-leaf path of T''_j ending with v. Recall that v is a subdivision vertex of G_m and note that $C_{i,j}$ is exactly the clause C_v of $\varphi(G_m)$. As v is a meaningful vertex, it does not belong to S and hence C_v is a clause of $\varphi(G_m)|_S$.

Conversely, let C_v be a clause of $\varphi(G_m)|_S$. Then v is a meaningful vertex. That is, v is adjacent to respective leaves ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 of some trees T'_i and T'_j. By construction and the second statement above, v is the joint leaf of T''_i and T''_j and, by definition of C_v, it is exactly $C_{i,j}$. ■

B.3 Proof of Theorem 5

Let S be an assignment to the variables of $\varphi(G_m)$. Then for any fixed d, the size of smallest d-NBP computing $\varphi(G_m)$ is greater than or equal to the size of the smallest d-NBP computing $\varphi(G_m)|_S$. The reason for this is that an d-NBP Z computing $\varphi(G_m)$ can be transformed into a d-NBP computing $\varphi(G_m)|_S$ without increase of size. Indeed, for each edge e of Z labelled with a literal x of a variable of S, remove the label if

$x \in S$ or remove the edge e if $\neg x \in S$. Let Z' be an NBP obtained by the union of all source-sink paths of of Z where no edge has been removed and the removal of labels as above preserved. Then Z' computes $\varphi(G_m)|_S$. Indeed, let S' be such that $S \cup S'$ is a satisfying assignment of $\varphi(G_m)$. Let P be a computational path of Z with $A(P) \subseteq S \cup S'$. No edges of P are removed and all the labels of S are removed in Z' so P remains a computational path of Z' and the assignment on P in Z' is a subset of S', hence S' is a satisfying assignment of the function computed by Z'.

Conversely, let S' be a satisfying assignment of the function computed by Z'. That is Z' has a computational path P' with $A(P') \subseteq S'$. Then P' is a path of Z and additional labels on P' are all elements of S (they do not contain occurrences opposite to S' and do not contain two opposite occurrences). That is P' is a computational path of Z with an assignment being a subset of $S \cup S'$ and hence S' is a satisfying assignment of $\varphi(G_m)$.

By Theorem 1, for each sufficiently large m there is a pseudoexapnder H_m with m roots and max-degree of the underlying graph at most $m^{1/4.9}$. Then it follows from Lemma 21 that for each sufficiently large m there is an assignment S_m to the variables of $\varphi(G_m)$ such that $\varphi(G_m)|_{S_m} = \phi(H'_m)$, where H'_m is a pseudoexpander with m roots. By Theorem 4 computing $\varphi(G_m)|_{S_m}$ requires d-NBP of exponential size in m. Since, as shown above, the size of d-NBP needed to compute $\varphi(G_m)$ is at least as large and the number of variables of $\varphi(G_m)$ is polynomial in m, a d-NBP of exponential size is required to compute $\varphi(G_m)$. ■

C Proof of auxiliary lemmas for Theorem 2

Proof of Lemma 5. We are going to prove the following statement. Let P be a computational path of Z on which each variable occurs exactly d times where $d \leq \log m/40000$. Then P contains a set X of vertices of size at most $\log m/4000$ that separates two subsets of $Roots(H)$ of size at least $m^{0.999}/3$.

Let us verify that the lemma follows from the above statement. By definition of H, $n \leq 3m^2$. Therefore, $\log n/10^5 \leq \log 3m^2/10^5 = (\log m/50000) + 3 \leq \log m/40000$ for sufficiently large m. Therefore, the above mentioned set X of vertices can be found for $d \leq \log n/10^5$ and as $m \leq n$, the size of this set is at most $\log n/4000$, as required by the lemma.

Definition of an interval. For an arbitrary sequence $s_1, \ldots, s_b$, and $1 \leq i \leq q \leq b$, let us call the subsequence $s_i, s_{i+1}, \ldots s_q$ of consecutive elements of $s_1, \ldots, s_b$ an *interval* of $s_1, \ldots, s_b$.

The key observation for this proof is the following claim.

Claim 2. *Let SEQ be a sequence of elements of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ where each element appears at most $m/40000$ times. Then, for a sufficiently large m, there is a partition of SEQ into intervals $SEQ_1, \ldots, SEQ_{c+1}$, where $c \leq \log m/4000$ and two disjoint subsets U_1 and U_2 of size at most $m^{0.999}$ each such that one of the following two statements is true.*

1. *Elements of U_1 occur only in SEQ_i with an odd i and elements of U_2 occur only in SEQ_i with an even i.*

2. *Elements of U_1 occur only in SEQ_i with an even i and elements of U_2 occur only in SEQ_i with an odd i.*

Let us show how the lemma follows from Claim 2. Let P be a computational path of Z. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_a$ be the sequence of literals of variables of $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$ appearing in the order as they occur along P. Let $SEQ^* = v_1, \ldots, v_q$ be the sequence where each v_i is u_i is u_i is the positive literal and $\neg u_i$ otherwise. That is, SEQ^* is nothing else than a sequence of elements of $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$. As $|\mathbf{Roots}(H)| = m$ and each element occurs at most $\log m/40000$ times (see the second paragraph of the proof for justification), Claim 2 applies to SEQ^*. In particular, there is a partition $SEQ^*_1, \ldots, SEQ^*_{c+1}$ of SEQ^* into intervals, where $c \leq \log m/4000$ and two disjoint subsets U_1 and U_2 of $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$ such that at least one of the two statements of Claim 2 happens with SEQ^* replacing SEQ.

Let $i_1, \ldots, i_c$ be such that for $1 \leq j \leq c$, v_{i_j} is the last element of SEQ^*_j. It is not hard to see that P can be partitioned into subpaths $P_1, \ldots, P_{c+1}$ such that the sequence of occurrences of $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$ on P_1 is $u_1, \ldots, u_{i_1}$ and for each $1 < j \leq c+1$, the sequence of occurrences of $\mathbf{Roots}(H)$ on P_j is $u_{i_{j-1}+1}, \ldots, u_{i_j}$. Consequently one of the following two statements is true.

1. Elements of U_1 occur only in P_i with an odd i and elements of U_2 occur only in P_i with an even i.

2. Elements of U_1 occur only in P_i with an even i and elements of U_2 occur only in P_i with an odd i.

Therefore, the set $x_1, \ldots, x_c$ of respective ends of $P_1, \ldots, P_{c+1}$ separates U_1 and U_2 as required.

Proof of Claim 2. An interval S of SEQ is a *link* between two disjoint subsets U_1 and U_2 of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ if no element of $U_1 \cup U_2$ occurs as an intermediate element of S and one of the following two statements is true.

- An element of U_1 occurs as the first element of S and an element of U_2 occurs as the last element of S.

- An element of U_1 occurs as the first element of S and an element of U_2 occurs as the last element of S.

Let $s = \log m/4000 + 1$. We claim that there are two disjoint subsets U_1 and U_2 of size $\ell = \lfloor m/(2^{s+1}) \rfloor$ that SEQ has at most $s-1$ links between them. Indeed, assume the opposite. Then, in particular, SEQ has at least s links between every $U_1 \subseteq \{1, \ldots, m/2\}$ and $U_2 \subseteq \{m/2+1, \ldots, m\}$ of size ℓ each. By Theorem 1.1. of Alon and Maass [1], $|SEQ| \geq 1/8 * m(s-9)$. On the other hand, as each element of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ occurs at most $\log m/40000$ times, $|SEQ| \leq m * \log m/40000$. That is, $\log m/40000 \geq 1/8 * (s-9)$ or, after a transformation, $\log m/5000 + 9 \geq s = \log m/4000 + 1$, which is incorrect for a sufficiently large m. This contradiction proves the correctness of the initial claim.

Note that $\ell \geq m/2^{\log m/4000+2} = m^{3999/4000}/4 \geq m^{0.999}$ for a sufficiently large m. Therefore, it remains to show that there is a partition $SEQ_1, \ldots, SEQ_{c+1}$ of SEQ

into intervals with $c \leq s-1$ for which one of the statements of Claim 2 is true. Let $I_1, \ldots, I_c$ be a largest set of links between U_1 and U_2, $c \leq s-1$ by assumption.

As the first element of the link, completely determines the link itself, the first elements of $I_1, \ldots, I_c$ are all different. We assume that they occur on SEQ in the order the respective links are listed. Note that for two consecutive links I_i, I_{i+1}, the first element of I_{i+1} is either the last element of I_i or occurs on SEQ after the last element of I_i. Indeed, since the first element of I_{i+1} occurs after the first element of I_i, any 'deeper' overlap would imply that the first element of I_{i+1} does not belong to $U_1 \cup U_2$, a contradiction. With this in mind, we can define the following intervals $SEQ_1, \ldots, SEQ_{c+1}$. SEQ_1 is the prefix of SEQ whose last element is the first element of SEQ. For each $1 < i \leq c$, SEQ_i is the interval of SEQ whose first element is the one immediately following the last element of SEQ_{i-1} and whose last element is the first element of I_i. Finally, SEQ_{c+1} is the suffix of SEQ whose first element is the one immediately following the last element of SEQ_c. Note that for each $1 \leq i \leq c$, the last element of I_i belongs to SEQ_{i+1}.

Assume w.l.o.g. that the first element of I_1 belongs to U_1. Then we prove by induction on $1 \leq i \leq c+1$ That elements of U_1 occur in only in intervals SEQ_i with i being odd and the elements of U_2 occur only in intervals SEQ_i with i being even.

Consider first SEQ_1. By assumption, its last element belongs to U_1. Assume that SEQ_1 has another element of belongs to U_2. As all the elements of U_2 occur in SEQ_1 before the last one, we can identify the last element u in SEQ_1 that belongs to U_2 and the first element v of U_1 following u. Then the interval between u and v is a link located before I_1, that is SEQ has at least $c+1$ links between U_1 and U_2 in contradiction to the maximality of c.

Assume now that $i > 1$. Assume first that $i \leq c$. We can assume w.l.o.g. that i is even for the proof for the case where i is odd is symmetric. By the induction assumption, all the elements of $U_1 \cup U_2$ that belong to SEQ_{i-1} in fact belong to U_1. In particular, the first element of I_{i-1} belongs to U_1. Therefore, the last element u' of I_{i-1} belongs to U_2. By construction, any element of SEQ_i preceding u' is an intermediate element of I_{i-1} and hence does not belong to $U_1 \cup U_2$. Therefore, if SEQ_i contains an element of U_1 then it occurs after u'. Consequently, we can identify on SEQ_i the first element v of U_1 and the last element u of U_2 preceding it. The interval between u and v is a link that lies between I_{i-1} and I_i, again implying that SEQ has at least $c+1$ links in contradiction to the maximality of c.

Assume now that $i = c+1$. Again, we can assume w.l.o.g. that i is even. Arguing as in the previous case, we observe that if SEQ_{c+1} contains elements of U_1 then SEQ_{i+1} contains a link occurring after I_c in contradiction to the maximality of c. ■

Proof of Lemma 6 Let c be such that $|X| = c-1$ and let Q be a path containing X and on which X generates a partition $Q_1, \ldots, Q_c$ such that one of the following two statements is true.

1. Elements of Y_1 occur only on Q_i with an odd i and elements of Y_2 occur on only Q_i with an even i.

2. Elements of Y_1 occur only on Q_i with an even i and elements of Y_2 occur on only Q_i with an odd i.

We assume w.l.o.g. that the first statement is true. In fact, due to the uniformity of Z, a stronger statement is true.

Claim 3. *For each path P containing X, let $P_1, \ldots, P_c$ be the partition of P generated by X. Then elements of Y_1 occur only on P_i with an odd i and elements of Y_2 occur on only P_i with an even i.*

Proof. Due to Z being a DAG, the vertices of X occur in the same order on each path containing X. In particular, this means that for each $1 \leq i \leq q$, P_i and Q_i have the same initial vertex and the same final vertex. Assume that the claim does not hold for some $1 \leq i \leq q$. If i is odd this means that an element of Y_2 occurs in P_i and does not occur in Q_i in contradiction to Lemma 2. Similarly, if we assume that the claim does not hold for some even i then this means that an element of Y_1 occurs on P_i while not occurring on Q_i again in contradiction to Lemma 2. □

Let $Q'_1, \ldots, Q'_c$ and $Q''_c \ldots Q''_c$ be respective partitions of Q' and Q'' generated by X. Let $Q^*_k = Q'_k$ whenever k is odd and $Q^*_k = Q''_k$ whenever k is even. Let $Q^* = Q^*_1 + \cdots + Q^*_c$. Clearly, Q^* is a source-sink path of Z. We prove that Q^* is a computational path assigning all the vertices of $Y'_1 \cup Y'_2$ negatively.

Assume the first statement does not hold, that is Q^* is not a computational path. Then there is a variable x that occurs on Q^* both positively and negatively. As all the labels of Q^* are either labels of Q' or labels of Q'' which do not have opposite variable occurrences due to being computational paths, variable x occurs positively in one of $A(Q'')$, $A(Q'')$ and negatively in the other. As all the variables of $Vars(Z) \setminus (Y_1 \cup Y_2)$ have the same occurrence in both $A(Q')$ and $A(Q'')$ x must belong to $Y_1 \cup Y_2$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $x \in Y_1$. The case with $x \in Y_2$ is symmetric. By Claim 3 x occurs only on paths Q^*_i with odd i. However, all these paths are subpaths of Q'. That is, all the occurrences of x on Q^* are occurrences of x on Q'. Since the latter is a computational path and cannot contain opposite occurrences of the same variable, Q^* does not contain opposite occurrences of x. Thus we have arrived at a contradiction that the there are no variables having opposite occurrences on Q^*, thus confirming that Q^* is a computational path.

In order to show that all the variables of $Y'_1 \cup Y'_2$ are falsified by Q^*, consider a variable $x \in Y'_1$. Then all the occurrences of x are on Q^*_i with an odd i. That is, all the occurrences of x on Q^* are occurrences of Q'. As Q' assigns x negatively, so is Q^*. For $x \in Y'_2$, the reasoning is symmetric with the even fragments of Q^* used instead the odd ones and Q'' instead Q'. ■

D Proof of Proposition 1 (Sketch).

Let us pick a random assignment to the variables of H using the following procedure.

1. Arbitrarily order the variables of ϕ_H so that all the non-leaf variables are ordered before the leaf variables.

2. Pick a literal of each non-leaf variable with probability 0.5 for both positive and negative literals.

3. For each leaf variable $\ell_{i,j}$, do as follows.

   - If a positive literal has been chosen for at least one non-leaf variable of $C_{i,j}$ choose either the positive or the negative literal of $\ell_{i,j}$ with probability 0.5.
   - Otherwise, choose the positive literal of $\ell_{i,j}$ with probability 1.

Let the probability of the resulting assignment be the product of the individual probabilities of the chosen literals.

Let $S \in \mathbf{SAT}$. By construction, the probabilities of literals of non-leaf variables are 0.5 and the probabilities of literals of leaf variables are 0.5 if and only if they are not fixed. It follows that the probability assigned to S by the above procedure is $(1/2)^{|S \setminus Fix(S)|}$ exactly as in the defined probability space.

If $S \notin \mathbf{SAT}$ then there is a clause $C_{i,j}$ falsified by S. In particular, this means that $\ell_{i,j}$ occurs negatively in S as well as the rest of variables of $C_{i,j}$. Clearly, according to the above procedure, the probability of a negative literal of $\ell_{i,j}$ is 0 and hence the probability assigned to S is 0 as well.

It follows that the sum of probabilities of assignments obtained by the above procedure is in fact the sum of probabilities of satisfying assignments (which are the same as in our probability space). To show that the sum of probabilities is 1, represent the process of choosing a random assignment as a rooted decision tree with probabilities of literals being the weights of the edges of the tree and the weight of a path being the product of weights of its edges and the weight of a collection of paths being the sum of weights of paths in this collection. Then, starting from the leaves and moving towards the root, argue by induction that the weight of each subtree is 1. ■